

Objectivism Kritik
--------------------

Objectivism Kritik.....	1
Objectivism 1NC .....	2
Objectivism 1NC .....	3
Objectivism 1NC .....	4
Objectivism 1NC .....	5
Links—Transportation Infrastructure (Regulations) .....	6
Links—Highways.....	7
Links—Mass Transit.....	8
Links—Congestion/Highways .....	9
Links—Altruism .....	10
Links—Environment .....	11
Links—Government Action .....	12
Links—Positive Rights .....	13
Links—Rights .....	14
Links—Social Obligation .....	15
Links—Taxation .....	16
Links—Taxation .....	17
Links—Welfare State .....	18
Impacts—Altruism is Violent .....	19
Impacts—Extinction .....	20
Impacts—Genocide.....	21
Impacts—Genocide.....	22
Impacts—Property Rights Key .....	23
Impacts—Tyranny.....	24
Impacts—Tyranny.....	25
Impacts—Value to Life.....	26
Impacts—War .....	27
Alternative—Debate Solves .....	28
Alternative—Free Market Solves Cooperation.....	29
Alternative—Free Market Solves Environment .....	30
Alternative—Free Market Solves Violence.....	31
Alternative—Free Market Solves Space .....	32
Alternative—Free Market Solves Space (Empirical) .....	33
Alternative—Free Market Solves Space (Empirical) .....	34
Alternative—Reject Coercion .....	35
Alternative—Reject Coercion .....	36
Alternative—Reject Coercion .....	37
Alternative—Solves Better, Privatization.....	38
Alternative—Solves Railroads/Freight .....	39
Alternative—Solves Racism/Civil Rights.....	40
AT: Urban Sprawl Bad .....	41
AT: Privatized Infrastructure Doesn't Work .....	42
AT: Alternative Not Realistic .....	43
AT: Permutation .....	44
AT: Role Playing Good.....	45
AT: Our Plan Won't Be Coercive.....	46
AT: Coercion/State Inevitable .....	47
AT: Impact Non-Unique.....	48
AT: Permutation .....	49
AT: Permutation .....	50
AT: Utilitarianism .....	51
AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh .....	52
AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh .....	53
AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh .....	54
AT: Objectivism Immoral .....	55
Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Good .....	56
Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Good .....	57
Aff—Alternative Immoral and Violent .....	58
Aff—Cars Good .....	59
Aff—Extinction Outweighs.....	60
Aff—Alternative→ Corporate Domination .....	61
Aff—Taxation Good.....	62

## Objectivism 1NC

## Status Quo Infrastructure is Failing Due to Lack of Investment—The Only Solutions are Either The Efficiency of Privatization or MASSIVE Tax Increases That Won't Be Tolerated By Americans

LA Times, "For sale: U.S. infrastructure?" July 13th, 2011 (<http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/13/opinion/la-oe-schweitzer-infrastructure-20110713>)

Last week, Rep. **John L. Mica** (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, **introduced a bill that would slash transportation spending, limiting it to the amount brought in by federal gas tax revenues and other existing highway fees. That roughly translates into federal spending of \$215 billion to \$230 billion over six years for highway and transit projects — about half of what the Obama administration sought last year.**

The draconian spending proposal, dubbed "the Republican road to ruin" by critics, comes at a time when groups such as the American Society of Civil Engineers are saying that **the U.S. needs to invest an additional \$1 trillion beyond current levels over the next decade** just to maintain and repair existing infrastructure.

We are facing a road infrastructure crisis, and it is of our own making. The federal gas tax has been unchanged, at 18 cents, since 1993, even as vehicles have gotten more fuel efficient. Adjusted for inflation, it amounts to a measly 12 cents today. But Americans, according to surveys, don't want to raise the tax.

For politicians like Mica, **this opens doors to privatization projects. Last month, he introduced a bill that would put private companies in charge of Amtrak's operations in the Northeast Corridor. Taking that step, he contended, would be the fastest way to get high-speed rail up and running in the U.S. because it's clear that President Obama's federally sponsored rail plan has little support in Congress.**

Maybe Mica is right. But rushing to privatize state-owned assets can lead to terrible infrastructure deals that let private companies walk away with prime assets and leave taxpayers with no guarantee of better services or lower fees.

Unlike the Greeks, who must sell to receive bailout funds, we still have a say in our infrastructure future. But **the time for planning ahead and striking strong deals is dwindling, along with our infrastructure funds. Many European countries and cities have privatized infrastructure and city services. You want to use the highway — you pay. You want to stroll through a "public" garden — you pay. You can avoid higher taxes, but if you want the services, you pay the private company that holds the franchise. It is a system that works fine for those with cash to spend.**

**Scaling down public ownership of transportation networks also means carefully selecting which parts of the system to sell or lease out.**

Private companies usually desire assets associated with the most demand for services, such as the Northeast Corridor. But if we sell off or lease these assets to get private companies to build a high-speed rail system there, we may also be giving up the only part of a high-speed rail network likely to generate enough cash in the long term to keep a national system running without taxpayer help.

So far, privately run transportation projects show mixed outcomes. For every successful privatization story of service improvement and mounting profits — Britain's airport privatization, say — there's a disaster story of poor service and taxpayers left holding the bailout bag: think the Chunnel or Chicago's privatized parking woes. Privatized transportation projects carry risks for both sides.

So long as Americans refuse to even index gas taxes to inflation, let alone raise the tax outright, **we won't be spending enough to maintain our transportation infrastructure, which means that its value will continue to fall.**

That will make it difficult to attract private investment or get a fair price for state-owned assets if the government opts to privatize its transportation assets. Too many more years of disinvestment and we will have to make gun-to-the-head decisions like Greece's, shock ourselves with big tax increases later, or both.

Without new revenue sources, the long-term problems for U.S. infrastructure finance are going to continue even if Congress manages a debt-ceiling deal. By contrast, if the U.S. defaults on its debt, our bond ratings will tumble. The higher costs of bond financing would then raise infrastructure costs through the roof. And those financing costs would put government negotiators at even more of a disadvantage in privatization deals.

Averting default would give U.S. leaders wiggle room to find public-private partnerships that really do serve the public interest. To do so, they must choose to maintain both America's credibility and its existing assets.

Objectivism 1NC
-----------------

**Taxation is Theft—Government is Simply a Voluntary Association of People, It Can Have No Rights Individual People Do Not—The Affirmative Use of Government Financial Support for Space Destroys Rights and Alienates the Individual**

Americany Yours, "Taxation is Theft," June 9th, 2010 (<http://americanlyyours.com/2010/06/09/taxation-is-theft/>)

**Even most children know that taking things without permission is known as stealing.**

There are three methods of acquiring property: homesteading, voluntary exchange, and theft. The first two methods are just, while **theft is inherently unjust. Taxation involves taking things without permission and must be classified as theft.**

However, before deciding on whether or not taxation should be considered theft, the term "taxation" must be defined. I will define taxation as "a government mandated extraction of resources from individuals and/or groups, paid to support the aims of the government."

**The phrase, "mandatory extraction" is the key to understanding why taxation is theft. A mandatory extraction, by nature, is taken through the use of force or coercion, and not paid voluntarily.**

**Theft is always theft, regardless of who does the theft, how the theft occurs, and what excuses the thief makes to "justify" the theft.** The ONLY exception to this statement is when things are taken as restitution for a prior wrong (for example, if you stole \$100 from a person, a court would be justified in taking \$100 from you without your permission to repay the victim).

Before I go on, I must address a question that I will surely be asked by many readers: **arent taxes special because they are taken by the government in order to provide people with their basic needs?**

**The answer to this question is a flat NO!**

**People have certain inalienable rights which should never be violated. It would be wrong of me to kill you, rob you, or physically harm you. Governments are made up of people, and are often created by people to secure their rights. Because governments are made up only of people, governments cannot have any rights that people themselves do not have.** It simply does not make sense for this to be untrue. **Rights are rights, people are people. Any claims that the government has more rights than anyone else is arguing that some people (the populace) should be considered inferior and subordinate to others (the government).**

**Taxation involves taking property from people without their consent: taxation is theft.**

Objectivism 1NC
-----------------

**Robbing Individuals of Their Self-Ownership is the Greatest Threat To Human Survival**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, "The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism," July 1989 ( p. 145)

**A society that robs an individual of the product of his effort, or enslaves him, or attempts to limit the freedom of his mind, or compels him to act against his own rational judgment, a society that sets up a conflict between it's ethics and the requirements of man's nature – is not, strictly speaking, a society, but a mob held together by institutionalized gang-rule. Such a society destroys all values of human coexistence, has no possible justification, and represents, not a source of benefits, but the deadliest threat to man's survival.** Life on desert island is safer than and incomparably preferable than existence in Soviet Russia or Nazi Germany.

## Objectivism 1NC

## Privatization Is the Best Solution to All American Transportation Infrastructure Failings Now—It Accesses Both Physical and Economic Solutions to Congestion and Failure in the Status Quo

[Edward L. Glaeser](#), economics professor at Harvard, “Right-Turn Signal: Privatizing Our Way Out of Traffic,” Economix New York Times Blog, September 28th, 2010 (<http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/28/right-turn-signal-privatizing-our-way-out-of-traffic/>)

At this point, Mr. Winston is calling only for experiments, but if they are successful, he envisions **“privatizing and deregulating the vast majority of the transportation system” and “reducing the government’s primary role in this sector to mitigating externalities**, such as emissions, and to enforcing the antitrust laws.” His vision is breathtaking, and to make his ideas less overwhelming, Mr. Winston begins by reminding us that **roads, rails and airports were not always a public affair.**

**America’s early 19th century road network was built by turnpike entrepreneurs; airports and streetcar systems often began in private hands.** More than a tenth of the people listed in Harvard Business School’s [“Great American Business Leaders of the Twentieth Century”](#) had something to do with transportation.

Mr. Winston justifies his call for experimentation and reform with a series of scathing critiques of the status quo.

Some of his complaints will ring true to both economists and consumers: **“In-flight delays and earlier airport arrivals for security screening were estimated to cost passengers and airlines in the United States at least \$40 billion in 2005.” and “poor highway design and road conditions are a major contributor to accidents and fatalities that cost the U.S. economy hundreds of billions.”**

Other criticisms are more nuanced: **“Urban bus and rail systems tend to use standardized vehicles, instead of a mixed-vehicle fleet that could enable transit managers to adjust seat capacity to variations in passenger demand by time of day and route.”** he writes.

He also says that “given [Amtrak](#)’s limited ability to attract passengers on most routes, the loss in social welfare from a highly subsidized [high-speed rail](#) system is likely to be substantial.” And he concludes that “the [F.A.A.](#) could also reduce delays by expeditiously implementing technologies that have the capability of expanding navigable airspace around airports,” noting that “the [NextGen satellite-based system](#) could reduce air travel times and carrier operating costs.”

What public interventions could significantly improve travel?

**Policies can be split into “physical science” fixes – the approach of the engineer – and “social science” solutions that try to change behaviors. Some problems require an engineering solution:** it is hard to imagine almost a million New Yorkers drinking clean water in the 1850s without the [Croton Aqueduct](#).

**In other cases, engineering just won’t work without economics.**

Gilles Duranton and Matthew Turner’s [“Fundamental Law of Traffic Congestion: Evidence From the U.S.”](#) states that vehicle-miles-traveled increases roughly one-for-one with miles of roads built. More highways mean more drivers, so we are never going to build our way out of traffic congestion. People will keep on driving until they are made to pay for that privilege.

**Privatization, in principle, offers the possibility of working on both the engineering and economics fronts.**

**Private road operators or airports will charge higher fees during peak periods to cut down on congestion, and they have incentives to innovate technologically to attract customers and cut costs.**

Mr. Winston notes that capsule, or pod, hotels, “which enable fliers to nap between flights,” happen to be “available in private airports, but none is available in the United States.”

**Links—Transportation Infrastructure (Regulations)****Regulation of State Toll Roads and Highways Distrorts the Market and May Not Make Up for Construction—Should be Privatized**

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

The state turnpike agencies are a step in the right direction in that they are clearly closer to the marketplace than are the state highway departments. State turnpikes are major repositories of highway management expertise and, according to Gerald Pfeffer of UIC, several of them are "extremely well managed."<sup>(34)</sup> They have major disadvantages, however. As government-owned entities, their policies are politically determined. They have shown no interest in time-variable pricing, which is an essential tool for combating peak-hour congestion and for attaining efficient use of highway infrastructure. Consider what has happened in the New York area, which is perfectly set up geographically for the implementation of congestion pricing policies. The major bridges, tunnels, and traffic arteries are run by state toll agencies--the Port Authority, the Triborough Bridge Authority, the New York Thruway Authority, and the New Jersey Turnpike. None of those agencies has ever proposed a rational profit-maximizing price policy of the kind a private operator would insist upon. Such a policy, as implemented on SR-91 Express Lanes, would call for premium prices in rush hours, because that would benefit the company by maximizing profits and customers by offering free-flow conditions. New York's various toll and turnpike agencies, however, have consistently followed the perverse policy of offering deep discounts (up to 50 percent off) to purchasers of multiple tokens and coupons--predominantly rush-hour patrons. New York State agencies' pricing policies in effect provide rush-hour concessions and aggravate congestion. The agencies do that, not because their officers are stupid or malicious, but because they take orders from politicians, and politicians are usually responsive to small organized interest groups and demagoguery. Anti-congestion pricing has been discussed and proposed interminably in New York, but no public official has displayed the courage to talk any sense on the issue. Mayor Beame claimed that such tolls would "make a ghost town" of New York, and in 1991 when the Triborough Bridge Authority proposed to reduce its commuter discount from 33 percent to 10 percent, then governor Mario Cuomo, pandering to protesters, ordered the price of multiple-coupon purchases rolled back to provide a 50 percent discount.<sup>(35)</sup>

**Links—Highways****Private Industry Can Run the Highways Better than Status Quo—Government Creates Inefficiency and Cost Overruns**

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

There is enormous opportunity for entrepreneurship in highways—for example in catering to the special needs of truckers with liberalized width, height, and weight limits, and to car drivers by providing car-only lanes and real-time information about congestion, parking space availability, and commercial services. There is a plethora of new technologies being developed under the title "intelligent transportation" systems--gadgets to produce a map on a digital display in your car, to tell you what nearby services are available, and to tell you by synthetic voice where to turn. And smart weapons guidance technology from satellites and space-miniaturized sensors is being commercialized so that a variety of driver controls will soon be marketed to help the driver, or take over some car controls. Greyhound buses already carry collision avoidance radars, and on special lanes in California cars are being "hooked up" with the lead driver pulling a "train" of following cars by radio signals and computerized engine controls. Of a thousand such systems, perhaps 950 will be no more than gee whiz stories for Popular Science. But some will certainly find their way into use. Many will require that highways be adapted with special flyovers, ramps, and barriers, and that will require entrepreneurial profit-seeking management of the highways. In general, the bureaucratic mindset has difficulty coping with multiple use, so bureaucrats insist that HOV lanes be kept "uncontaminated" by solo drivers, even though almost everywhere, almost all the time, HOV lanes are extraordinarily wasteful, operating far below capacity. They also generate a political problem in that drivers in stop- and-start conditions on regular freeway lanes get infuriated by seeing an underutilized HOV lane next to them. They start breaking the rules and driving illegally in the HOV lanes, generating major enforcement problems, and they generate political pressure to liberalize entry rules. The obvious way to maximize HOV lane use, and make money, is to allow solo drivers (or sub-HOV vehicles) to "buy in" to HOV lanes with a variable toll. The purpose of the HOV lanes-- encouragement of carpooling--can be maintained by allowing toll-paying vehicles up to the point where they begin to fill the lane to capacity. Raising prices can prevent the concertina effect of successive backups and crawls. Gerald Pfeffer's California Private Transportation Company is gambling that on SR-91 Express Lanes the SOV buy-ins will pay for the road and also for the free rides of the HOVs. Variable pricing will also be a go/no-go issue for the investors in SR-57-S over the Santa Ana River channel in Orange County.

**Links—Mass Transit****Empirically, Mass Transit Violates Desire for Individualism, It Cannot Succeed in Deploying Costs**

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

Traffic congestion is a major annoyance to tens of millions of Americans and a \$100 billion annual economic loss. The traditional answer to highway backups, mass transit and carpooling, have not worked. The convenience of the private car for the vast majority of commuters makes even the most lavishly subsidized mass transit uncompetitive. Since 1956 most highways have been financed by gas taxes. Now those taxes are being siphoned off to transit and general revenue, and what is left for roads goes largely for maintenance and rebuilding, not new building. The revolt against rising taxes means that the only source of revenue for significant new highway capacity is the private sector.



## Links—Congestion/Highways

### All the Problems of Congestion, Waste and Extended Travel Times are Intrinsic to Public Ownership of the Highways

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

Backups on the highways are a daily source of frustration to tens of millions of Americans. Our cars and highways are engineered to transport us at 50 to 70 miles per hour (mph), yet in rush hours the highways regularly clog up and average speeds are 15 to 20 mph and declining each year. Worse perhaps than the average speed of travel is the variability of backups, which makes travel in rush hours so unpredictable and punctuality so difficult. The daily commute and other trips become tiresome irritations and a waste in our lives. Freeway systems are designed with generous high-speed lane widths, long acceleration and deceleration lanes, pull-off shoulders, and superelevation on curves, as well as long sight lines and no cross traffic. Superhighways are set up for our cars and trucks to cruise along safely at 50 to 70 mph, yet they are becoming parking lots full of stop-and-go traffic for hours each day. That is frustrating to drivers because the time lost is largely unproductive. Drivers find it hard to relax in jammed traffic because they keep wondering how late they are going to be, whether they should try another route, and whether the congestion ahead will suddenly clear.

The communist economic model has been discredited and abandoned in most places, but not on America's highways. Generally, our highways are built and managed by state agencies and offered "free" to the public. Instead of paying for road use directly, motorists provide highway funds through a byzantine system of license fees, registration charges, gas and diesel taxes, truck charges, special transportation sales taxes, and development district levies. After some of that money has gotten through the various bureaucracies, tax agencies, treasuries, and transportation administrations at different levels of government, after some has been diverted to transit systems and even general government revenues, what is left for roads is political "pork"--allocated by dealmaking between various government actors in Washington, state capitals, and county seats.

In Russia communism's failure was epitomized by constant shortages in stores. Empty shelves in supermarkets and department stores and customers in line, wasting hours each week, became the face of the system's failure, as well as a source of huge personal frustration, even rage. Communism failed because prices were not flexible to match supply and demand; because stores were bureaucracies, not businesses; and because revenues went into a central treasury and did not fuel increased capacity and improved service. We in supposedly capitalistic America suffer communism--an unpriced service provided by an unresponsive monopolistic bureaucracy--on most of our highways. Our manifestation of shortage, our equivalent of Russian lines at stores, is daily highway backups. There is no price on rush-hour travel to clear the market. There is no revenue stream directly from road users to road managers to provide incentives either to manage existing capacity to maximum consumer advantage or to adjust capacity to demand.

"Whenever the price of using some valued good does not increase as demand increases, that good will be in short supply. Shortages will be acute if supply cannot readily be enhanced," wrote the Transportation Research Board, an arm of the National Research Council. "In the absence of efficient pricing, motorists who drive on congested facilities are not required to pay for the delays they cause each other, and these delays are substantial. The wasted time and fuel are estimated to cost (at least) \$40 billion annually."<sup>(1)</sup>

The Texas Transportation Institute, a division of Texas A&M University, does regular studies of highway congestion under contract to the Federal Highway Administration. TTI surveys the congestion on the freeways and arterial roads of 50 cities with a total population of 106 million.<sup>(2)</sup>

In 1991, the latest year for which estimates are available, congestion caused 4.6 billion gallons of fuel to be wasted, cost 10.2 million hours of delays each day, and had an overall cost of \$44 billion.<sup>(3)</sup> About half of that cost was incurred in five large metropolitan areas--Los Angeles (\$7.8 billion), New York (\$6.6 billion), San Francisco-Oakland (\$2.8 billion), Washington, D.C. (\$2.4 billion), and Chicago (\$2.4 billion). Washington had the greatest congestion cost per vehicle (\$1,440), followed by San Bernardino-Riverside, California (\$1,340), New York (\$1,090), and Los Angeles (\$1,000). San Bernardino-Riverside had the highest congestion cost per person (\$870), followed by Washington (\$760), San Francisco-Oakland (\$740), San Jose (\$670), and Los Angeles (\$660).<sup>(4)</sup>

Congestion has long been recognized as an inner-city problem, but, as the TTI notes, it has now gotten "into the suburbs, with street systems designed for service to residential areas (now) overburdened with traffic headed to large shopping malls and business parks."<sup>(5)</sup> Because many internal combustion engines operate most efficiently at a steady 40 to 50 mph, stop-and-go traffic adds considerably to air pollution--emissions of carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds are worst at low engine speeds. In turn, the extra pollution increases the pressure, via the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and local regulatory agencies, to adopt cleaner (but more expensive) fuels, including highly expensive battery-stored electricity.<sup>(6)</sup>

The congestion problem is getting steadily worse. In its traffic congestion index (TCI), the TTI expresses congestion as the ratio of daily vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) to roadway design capacity (i.e., a ratio of 1 means that the roadways are carrying the traffic for which they were built). The average TCI for the 50 cities surveyed has gotten worse every year since 1982. In the decade before 1991 congestion overall worsened 17.5 percent.<sup>(7)</sup> In 47 cities congestion got worse, and in only three (Phoenix, Houston, and Detroit) did it lessen. In some places it got spectacularly worse: in San Diego the index went from 0.78 to 1.22, a 56 percent increase. The other cities with radically worsening congestion were Salt Lake City (0.63 to 0.86, up 37 percent), San Francisco-Oakland (1.01 to 1.34, up 33 percent), Sacramento (0.80 to 1.04, up 30 percent), and Washington (1.07 to 1.39, up 30 percent). In Los Angeles congestion worsened by 28 percent to an index of 1.56, in Chicago it worsened by 25 percent to 1.28, and in New York it worsened by 13 percent to 1.14.

The trend to gridlock is not confined to the largest cities. Medium-sized cities are also in trouble. Atlanta has a TCI of 1.14, a 28 percent deterioration over the decade; Seattle-Everett a TCI of 1.20, 27 percent worse; Dallas a TCI of 1.06, 26 percent worse; San Jose a TCI of 1.07, 26 percent worse; and Portland, Oregon, a TCI of 1.08, 24 percent worse. Twenty-five of the 50 largest cities had expressway and arterial traffic at saturated levels (TCI 1.0 and above) in 1991, compared with 11 of the 50 in 1982.<sup>(8)</sup>

**Links—Altruism****Statist Conceptions of Altruism are Destructive—They Support Violence and Nuclear Destruction**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*, 1966, ( p. 80)

Consider the plunder, the destruction, the starvation, the brutality, the slave-labor camps, the torture chambers, the wholesale slaughter perpetrated by dictatorships. Yet this is what today's alleged peace-lovers are willing to advocate or tolerate—in the name of love for humanity.

It is obvious that the ideological root of statism (or collectivism) is the tribal premise of primordial savages who, unable to conceive of individual rights, believed that the tribe is a supreme, omnipotent ruler, that it owns the lives of its members and may sacrifice them whenever it pleases to whatever it deems to be its own "good." Unable to conceive of any social principles, save the rule to brute force, they believed that the tribe's wishes are limited only by its physical power and that other tribes are its natural prey, to be conquered, looted, enslaved, or annihilated. This history of all primitive peoples is a succession of tribal wars and intertribal slaughter. That this savage ideology now rules nations armed with nuclear weapons, should give pause to anyone concerned with mankind's survival.

Statism is a system of institutionalized violence and perpetual civil war. It leaves men no choice but the right to seize political power—to rob or be robbed, to kill or be killed. When brute force is the only criterion of social conduct, and unresisting surrender to destruction is the only alternative, even the lowest of men, even an animal—even a cornered rat—will fight. There can be no peace within an enslaved nation.

**Links—Environment****State Management of the Environment is a Coercive Policy To Increase Coercion**

Allan K. Fitzsimmons, President of Balanced Resource Solutions, an environmental-economic consulting firm ,  
"Federal Ecosystem Management: A "Train Wreck" in the Making CATO Policy Analysis, October 16th, 1994  
(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-217es.html>)

The Ecosystem Management Initiative, launched by President Clinton as part of his effort to "reinvent" government, signals a radical departure from past environmental policy. The idea is to avoid what the administration aptly terms policy "train wrecks"--collisions of economic enterprise and environmental preservation--before they occur. The administration seeks to reach that goal by having the federal government manage and protect ecosystems throughout the country.

Analysis shows that the assumptions behind the policy are incorrect. The nation is not facing serious environmental perils requiring drastic new federal policies. The ecosystem concept, while quite useful within the realm of science from which it was borrowed, is inappropriate for use as a geographic guide for public policies. Instead of introducing science into public policy, use of the ecosystem concept interjects uncertainty, imprecision, and arbitrariness.

Federal management of ecosystems would significantly expand federal control of the use of privately owned land and lead to increased restrictions on the use of the nation's public lands for economic purposes.

Economic activity and private property rights would be subordinated to ecosystem protection.

The key to minimizing "train wrecks" is the abandonment of existing policies that elevate environmental protection above the pursuit of human welfare. Restoration of policy equilibrium and greater reliance on market forces, rather than further movement toward coercive federal regulations and additional intrusions of the government into land-use decisions, should guide federal actions.

**Links—Government Action****Coercion is a Characteristic of Government—All State Decisions are Inherently Coercive and Imposing**

Harry Browne, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work, 1995 (p.10-11)

The distinctive feature of the government is coercion – the use of force and the threat of force to win obedience. This is how government differs from every other agency in society. The others persuade; government compels. When someone demands that government help flood victims, he is saying he wants to force people to pay for flood relief. Otherwise, he'd be happy to have the Red Cross and its supporters handle everything. When someone wants government to limit the price of a product, he is asking to use force to prevent people from paying more for something they want. Otherwise, he would simply urge people not to patronize those he things are charging too much. When Congress passes a bill mandating "family leave," it forces every employer to provide time off for family problems – even if its employees want the employer to use payroll money for some other benefit. Otherwise, employers and employees would be free to decide what works best in each situation. Nothing involving government is voluntary – as it would be when a private company does something. One way or another, there is compulsion in every government activity: - The government forces someone to pay for something; - The government forces someone to do something; or – The government forcibly prevents someone from doing something. There is no other reason to involve government.

**Links—Positive Rights****The Conception of Private Rights is In Direct Opposition to the True Rights of Liberty—It Trades Off With Actual Individualism**

Tibor Machan. Professor emeritus in the department of philosophy at Auburn University, *Libertarianism: For and Against*, 2005 (p. 24-25)

This was a view of rights that wiped the fact of human moral agency right out of existence. Positive rights, so called, are thus nothing more than mislabeled preferences or values that people want the government to satisfy or attain for them – of course, by force. They are grounded in nothing that pertains to the fundamental requirements of human nature and human survival. The theorizers of such rights in fact go out of their way to ignore such requirements. Yes, people need bread, as stipulated. But they do not live by bread alone. They are not ants, that can survive on what crumbs fate happens to strew in their path. They need the freedom to make the bread and trade the bread. Also, they need consistent and objective governance. But when the conceptual perversion known as positive rights becomes the guiding principle of a polity, the state cannot govern by anything like the consistent standards that emerge from the theory of negative rights. The alleged positive rights of the citizenry must clash constantly. To the extent one is conscripted to serve another, one can no longer serve one's own purposes – nor, indeed, even the purposes of many others, given the scarcity of the time and skills to which others are supposedly naturally entitled. There is no principle implicit in the doctrine of positive rights which could resolve the conflicts. But positive rights conflict most of all with our basic negative rights to life, liberty, and property. Guided by such a doctrine, governments cannot merely protect our rights. They must positively pit some rights against other rights. Instead of simply "securing these rights," they must scrounge for some additional standard by which to tell which and whose rights should get protection. Since no such intelligible standard is available, the situation collapses into one of rule not by objective law but by subjective men- men who will decide which rights need protection and which do not, on a shifting "case-by-case basis." Perhaps the ascendant pressure group of the moment will carry the day, or perhaps the latest opinion polls. In practice, the working (Hobbesian?) principle is: "you have a right to whatever you can get away with," the same consideration governing any plain criminal.

**Links—Rights****All Your Conceptions of Rights are Subordinate to Property Rights—The Attempt to Assert Positive Rights Can Only Damage Them**

Ayn Rand, *Philosopher*, *The Virtue of Selfishness* 1964 (p. 94)

The right to property means that a man has the right to take the economic actions necessary to earn property, to use it and to dispose of it; it does not mean that others must provide him with property.

The right of free speech means that a man has the right to express his ideas without danger of suppression, interference or punitive action by the government. It does not mean that others must provide him with a lecture hall, a radio station or a printing press through which to express his ideas.

Any undertaking that involves more than one man, requires the voluntary consent of every participant. Every one of them has the right to make his own decision, but none has the right to force his decision on the others.

There is no such thing as “a right to a job”—there is only the right of free trade, that is: a man’s right to take a job if another man chooses to hire him. There is no “right to a home,” only the right of free trade: the right to build a home or to buy it. There are no “rights to a ‘fair’ wage or a ‘fair’ price” if no one chooses to pay it, to hire a man or to buy his product. There are no “rights of consumers” to milk, shoes, movies or champagne if no producers choose to manufacture such items (there is only the right to manufacture them oneself). There are no “rights” of special groups, there are no “rights of farmers, of workers, of businessmen, of employees, of employers, of the old, of the young, of the unborn.” There are only the Rights of Man—rights possessed by every individual man and by all men as individuals.

Property rights and the right of free trade are man’s only “economic rights” (they are, in fact, political rights)—and there can be no such thing as “an economic bill of rights.” But observe that the advocates of the latter have all but destroyed the former.

**Links—Social Obligation****The Idea of a Commitment to Society Violates the Basic Liberty of Each Individual, Sacrifices them to a Collective Good that Can Only Destroy Freedom**

Leonard Peikoff, former professor of philosophy at New York University, *“Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand,”* 1991 (p. 360-361)

All rights rest on the ethics of egoism. Rights are an individual's selfish possessions-his title to his life, his liberty, his property, the pursuit of his own happiness. Only a being who is an end in himself can claim a moral sanction to independent action. If man existed to serve an entity beyond himself, whether God or society, then he would not have rights, but only the duties of a servant. Whoever understands the philosophy of Objectivism (or implicitly accepts an Aristotelian morality of self-interest, as was done by the political thinkers of the Enlightenment), can read off the proper human rights effortlessly; this may cause him to regard such rights, in the wording of the Declaration of Independence, as "self-evident." Rights, however, are not self-evident. They are corollaries of ethics as applied to social organization-if one holds the right ethics, If one does not, none of them stands. The rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness are the only rights treated by philosophical politics. They are the only rights formulated in terms of broad abstractions and resting directly on universal ethical principles.

**Links—Taxation****Taxation is Involuntary and Based Solely on the Threat of Force—It is the Definition of Theft**

George Donnelly, Teacher and Author, "[Taxation is Theft Because it's Involuntary and Permanently Denies People their Property](http://georgedonnelly.com/libertarian/taxation-is-theft)," August 16th, 2010 (<http://georgedonnelly.com/libertarian/taxation-is-theft>)

Taxation is theft because it is the use of aggression to deny another person their property. It doesn't matter what their property is to be used for or what complicated arguments are made to justify it. Taxation is involuntary and it results in a person's property being permanently taken. This is all that is necessary for our thesis to be proven.

Some will claim that taxation is a voluntary process and it is true that some people avoid paying all or some of the property demanded by governments. But this is simply a lucky break, a crack in the government's nightstick through which a fortunate few escape. This does not blot out the fact of government's blanket threat of aggressive acts should they decide you haven't paid your fair share. Every year, innocent human beings are put through government wringers in search of unpaid taxes. Taxation is not voluntary. If it were, it would be called something else, like dues.

Others argue that taxation is a requirement for continued residence in the territory claimed by a particular government. As long as you stay, you owe what they must consider a kind of rent. This assumes that government is the owner of all the land under its domain, an implicit claim that the government in question doesn't permit private property. If it did, it would recognize that each land owner holds sovereignty over his individual plot, and could not be summarily denied his property. This argument is just a second, greater threat. "Pay 20 per cent of your income to us – or we'll take it all!"

Yet others will claim that taxes are payment for those services government provides. What if one doesn't want those services? What if they are substandard? There are no answers to these questions because these alleged services are provided involuntarily. You can hardly call that a voluntary arrangement.

One final argument might be that taxation is not theft because the taking of property is not permanent. After all, governments claim to serve their citizens by returning tax payments to them in the form of roads, parks, wars, defense services, courts and schools. Is it stolen or simply repurposed and returned? This argument might carry weight if title to the property were returned to the individuals involved. But it is not. It is held under title of the state. State enforcers are hired to ensure it is not used as each individual taxpayer sees fit, but as state officials decide. Thus, this argument fails.

Taxation is theft because it involves a first use of violence in order to permanently acquire someone else's property. State apologists may make excuses or wild conjecture in a vain attempt to justify this theft. But the fact remains that is theft. The only valid way to acquire someone else's property is through voluntary interaction. Taxation is involuntary.



**Links—Taxation****Taxation is an Inherently Coercive System—It Requires Involuntary Servitude to the State and Sacrifices Liberty**

Murray Rothbard, former teacher, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, New Liberty – Involuntary Servitude, no date, (<http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty4a.asp>)

In a sense, the entire system of taxation is a form of involuntary servitude. Take, in particular, the income tax. The high levels of income tax mean that all of us work a large part of the year? several months? for nothing for Uncle Sam before being allowed to enjoy our incomes on the market. Part of the essence of slavery, after all, is forced work for someone at little or no pay. But the income tax means that we sweat and earn income, only to see the government extract a large chunk of it by coercion for its own purposes. What is this but forced labor at no pay? The withholding feature of the income tax is a still more clear-cut instance of involuntary servitude. For as the intrepid Connecticut industrialist Vivien Kellems argued years ago, the employer is forced to expend time, labor, and money in the business of deducting and transmitting his employees' taxes to the federal and state governments, yet the employer is not recompensed for this expenditure. What moral principle justifies the government's forcing employers to act as its unpaid tax collectors?

**Links—Welfare State****The Welfare State is a Necessarily Coercive Undertaking, It Reduces the Moral Worth and Dignity of Each Human Individual**

Karen Minto, Full Context, "Ayn Rand and Objectivism: An Introduction," 2000  
(<http://www.fullcontext.org/Objectivism/politics.htm>)

The basis of the Objectivist political theory is the idea of individual rights. According to Objectivism, since individuals must deal with one another by voluntary cooperation and voluntary trade, any action which violates the consent of any party (typically by force or fraud) is immoral, and ought to be punishable by law. The use of (or threat to use) physical force is only legitimate in cases where one is protecting or defending one's life, liberty or property against thief, attacker, or tyrant. Objectivists agree with the American founding fathers that men are by nature entitled to the rights of life, liberty (including the liberty to justly acquire, own and trade property), and the pursuit of happiness. Objectivism maintains that the only just government is a limited government--limited to doing only those things that can be justified as necessary and indispensable for protecting individual rights: the police, the law courts, and the national defense forces. Every other function of government currently in place is unjust and morally invalid insofar as (i) it is financially supported by involuntary means--people do not have the legal right to opt out; (ii) it forbids the peaceful and honest conduct of business by people who want to set up companies that operate according their goals, standards and principles, and that pursue markets of their own choosing. Objectivists regard the coercive paternalism of the modern socialist welfare-state as pernicious and unjust. It treats adults like children who are helpless to care for themselves. Every adult who has a modicum of dignity, of self-respect, and a vision of what they want to become as human beings should raise their voices and pens in protest against the vulgar excesses of today's governments. Objectivism views the only just social system as a system of free, voluntary exchange of goods, services and ideas, i.e, laissez-faire capitalism.

**Impacts—Altruism is Violent****Altruism is the Basis for All Evil—The Violence of War and Holocaust Depends on Reliance on the Welfare State**

David Mayer, Professor of Law at Capital University, "STUPID, WRONG, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL: BILL CLINTON'S WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA" 1999 (<http://users.law.capital.edu/federalistsociety/fp3/kosovo.htm>)

This moral code of altruism is a very old, traditional moral code which has been responsible for virtually all the evil, all the suffering, that has occurred throughout human history. It is the same moral code which underlies the atrocities being committed in Kosovo itself, where people on both sides of the ethnic conflict (both Serbian and Albanian) ignore the rights of individuals and instead regard people as significant only as members of a collective (in this case, an ethnic group). Tyrants throughout human history have justified their tyranny by appealing to some form of collectivism. The pharaohs of ancient Egypt, the emperors of Imperial Rome, the kings of medieval Europe, all called upon their people to sacrifice their individual well-being to that of the collective; and their accomplices were the priests, who appealed to superstition and mysticism -- the supposed will of the one or more gods -- to convince the people that it was a "sin" not to sacrifice their well-being to the thugs who ran the government. In more recent times, totalitarian dictators on both the "left" and "right"-- Lenin, Stalin, or Mao, as well as Hitler, Mussolini, or Peron -- similarly have preached that the individual is nothing, that the collective is everything. They too have been supported by priests, of sorts, namely the so-called "intellectuals" who preach either a sectarian or secular form of civic religion which also condemned as sinful the individual's pursuit of his own happiness or self-interest and which preached a "duty" to serve the state. As F. A. Hayek has shown in his classic book by the same name, "The Road to Serfdom" has taken many paths in the 20th century. The call for "national service" which Bill Clinton and like-minded collectivists (again, both on the left and the right) made at the so-called "Presidents' Conference on America's Future," which took place in Philadelphia two years ago, in late April 1997, differs from the philosophy of other 20th-century totalitarians only in degree, not in kind (as the accompanying collection of quotations illustrate). The principle of altruism makes bad policy, whether in domestic law or in foreign relations. In domestic law, it has made possible the so-called "welfare state" and all the problems associated with it -- not only economically but socially and morally -- as David Kelley ably shows in his excellent new book, *A Life of One's Own*.

**Impacts—Extinction****Capitalist Processes of the Individual are Key to Sustain Human Life**

Robert TRACINSKI, the editor of The Intellectual Activist magazine, The Moral Basis of Capitalism, , The Center for the Advancement of Capitalism, January 17th, 2007

([http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\\_Moral\\_Basis\\_of\\_Capitalism.htm](http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The_Moral_Basis_of_Capitalism.htm))

What no one has grasped yet is that capitalism is not just practical but also moral. Capitalism is the only system that fully allows and encourages the virtues necessary for human life. It is the only system that safeguards the freedom of the independent mind and recognizes the sanctity of the individual. Every product that sustains and improves human life is made possible by the thinking of the world's creators and producers. We enjoy an abundance of food because scientists have discovered more efficient methods of agriculture, such as fertilization and crop rotation. We enjoy a lifespan double that of the pre-industrial era thanks to advances in medical technology, from antibiotics to X-rays to biotechnology, discovered by doctors and medical researchers. We enjoy the comfort of air conditioning, the speed of airline transportation, the easy access to information made possible by the World Wide Web—because scientists and inventors have made the crucial mental connections necessary to create these products.

**Impacts—Genocide****Government Intrusion Into the Private Individual Should Be Evaluated as Genocide—They are a Slippery Slope to Total Tyranny**

Harry Browne, executive director of public policy at American Liberty Foundation, *Why Government Doesn't Work* 1995 (p. 66)

The reformers of the Cambodian revolution claimed to be building a better world. They forced people into reeducation programs to make them better citizens. Then they used force to regulate every aspect of commercial life. Then they forced office workers and intellectuals to give up their jobs and harvest rice, to round out their education. When people resisted having their lives turned upside down, the reformers had to use more and more force. By the time they were done, they had killed a third of the country's population, destroyed the lives of almost everyone still alive, and devastated a nation. It all began with using force for the best of intentions—to create a better world. The Soviet leaders used coercion to provide economic security and to build a "New Man"—a human being who would put his fellow man ahead of himself. At least 10 million people died to help build the New Man and the Workers' Paradise. But human nature never changed—and the workers' lives were always Hell, not Paradise. In the 1930s many Germans gladly traded civil liberties for the economic revival and national pride Adolf Hitler promised them. But like every other grand dream to improve society by force, it ended in a nightmare of devastation and death. Professor R.J. Rummel has calculated that 119 million people have been killed by their own governments in this century. Were these people criminals? No, they were people who simply didn't fit into the New Order—people who preferred their own dreams to those of the reformers. Every time you allow government to use force to make society better, you move another step closer to the nightmares of Cambodia, the Soviet Union, and Nazi Germany. We've already moved so far that our own government can perform with impunity the outrages described in the preceding chapters. These examples aren't cases of government gone wrong; they are examples of government—period. They are what governments do—just as chasing cats is what dogs do. They are the natural consequence of letting government use force to bring about a drug-free nation, to tax someone else to better your life, to guarantee your economic security, to assure that no one can mistreat you or hurt your feelings, and to cover up the damage of all the failed government programs that came before.

## Impacts—Genocide

### Alternatives to Capitalist Economics Terminally End in Genocide

RJ RUMMEL, [professor emeritus](#) of [political science](#) at the [University of Hawaii](#), "The Killing Machine that is Marxism," World Net Daily, December 15th, 2004 ( [http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=41944](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=41944))

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide.

In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly than all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars.

And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster.

The Khmer Rouge – (Cambodian communists) who ruled Cambodia for four years – provide insight into why Marxists believed it necessary and moral to massacre so many of their fellow humans. Their Marxism was married to absolute power. They believed without a shred of doubt that they knew the truth, that they would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness, and that to realize this utopia, they had to mercilessly tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and Buddhist culture, and then totally rebuild a communist society. Nothing could be allowed to stand in the way of this achievement. Government – the Communist Party – was above any law. All other institutions, religions, cultural norms, traditions and sentiments were expendable.

The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths.

The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies.

What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequalled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions. Its equivalent would be everyone fleeing California, emptying it of all human beings.

There is a supremely important lesson for human life and welfare to be learned from this horrendous sacrifice to one ideology: No one can be trusted with unlimited power.

The more power a government has to impose the beliefs of an ideological or religious elite, or decree the whims of a dictator, the more likely human lives and welfare will be sacrificed. As a government's power is more unrestrained, as its power reaches into all corners of culture and society, the more likely it is to kill its own citizens.

**Impacts—Property Rights Key****Property Rights are the Basis of All Other Rights—They Must Be Our First and Only Priority**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, *The Virtue of Selfishness* 1964 (p. 94)

The right to life is the source of all rights—and the right to property is their only implementation. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort, the man who has no right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product, is a slave.

Bear in mind that the right to property is a right to action, like all the others: it is not the right to an object, but to the action and the consequences of producing or earning that object. It is not a guarantee that a man will earn any property, but only a guarantee that he will own it if he earns it. It is the right to gain, to keep, to use and to dispose of material values.

## Impacts—Tyranny

### **Any Tyranny Should be Evaluated as the Possibility of Complete Tyranny—We Must Reject Any Governmental Intrusion on Private Individuals**

Tibor Machan, Fellow at the Hoover Institution and Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Auburn University, *Liberty and Hard Cases*, 2002 (p. XII)

Yet as Robert Higgs (in *Crisis and Leviathan*) and others have shown, it is nearly impossible to reestablish limits on government once it has acquired the legal authority to expand its powers for the sake of handling emergencies. In the law and in the making of public policy, precedent counts for a great deal; there is a slippery slope here. Once an approach is legitimized, extensions of power beyond the particular and special areas originally intended are almost inevitable. The definition of what constitutes an eligible emergency tends to broaden. Eventually, no dire need whatever can be neglected by lawmakers. What might slow or reverse such encroachment is a change of heart, some fear of going too far or the like. But once the logic of intervening in a particular special case has been established, it is difficult to offer a persuasive rationale for declining to apply the same logic to similar cases—unless the legitimacy of the original intervention itself is challenged. As a result, most “temporary powers” assumed by government remain part of its permanent repertoire. Consider gun control legislation. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was undermined early on in our legislative history. And now, especially in the wake of tragic shootings—at schools, restaurants, post offices, amusement parks—it has become harder and harder to raise principled objections against more and more restrictions on the right of self-defense. Vocal members of the citizenry demand it, and the politicians have precedents. Such decline and fall of political principles serves to underscore the integrity of those principles. They can’t normally be violated, even a little, with impunity; minor incursions tend to snowball, especially when hallowed in law. Even so, a powerful tradition of political thinking challenges the value of such integrity. In contemporary U.S. politics and, indeed, around the world, it is often deemed to be a good thing to be “flexible.” Principled politics is dismissed by many sophisticated thinkers as “mere ideology.” Instead of ideology, they argue, we should embrace pragmatism. The term ideology is burdened by a number of pejorative connotations, often imported into the implicit definition of the term. For example, there is Marx’s claim that principled economic and political thinking can be nothing but rationalization for class interest (with his own economic and political thinking somehow granted exemption from this indictment, however). Those who defend a substantially laissez-faire, free market system—such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo—are on this view merely doing so to promote the class interest of capitalist, wealthy people served by such a system. Their principled advocacy amounts to nothing more than special pleading. “Ideology” is also supposed to be the hobbyhorse of the simplistic thinker, inclining one to provide knee-jerk solutions to complex problems. This is the charge lodged against those who would apply political principles to judge what public officials ought to do in particular cases. Presumably, the resort to principle allows one, perhaps even encourages one, to ignore details of the specific context at hand. An objective definition of ideology (i.e., one that doesn’t import various charges against believers in a particular ideology) might be a set of political values and doctrines advanced in support of a particular socialpolitical system. The definition says nothing about what those values and doctrines might be or whether their justification of a particular social system is successful. That has to be evaluated independently (i.e., the sheer fact of possessing a belief cannot be taken as proof of the falsehood or disingenuousness of that belief; it may well be that even if a capitalist says 2 plus 2 is 4, it really is 4.) and, to be sure, even the critics of ideology have ideologies of their own. Of course, theirs is usually construed as being the result of long and hard thinking and observations about community life, productive of sound judgments and evaluations; it’s the other person with the other ideology who is the thoughtless propagandist for rigid and unworkable answers. We don’t have to choose between facts of the case and principles that govern, however. Politics, in fact, requires both principled thinking and proper flexibility in applying those principles to the relevant context. Just as in our personal lives, so in politics and law we need basic ideas that serve as the foundation for understanding how human communities ought to function. And we need to practice and abide by those ideas. If they’re valid, we ought not ignore them when the tough cases come along, sacrificing the long-term benefits of principled action for the sake of short-term convenience. Yet it is also vital that cases be considered in light of the detailed facts, many of which may be new and might even require some modification of the principles that guide legal decision making. New ways of communicating, new religious movements, and new forms of artistic expression all require the application of familiar principles (such as those embodied in the First Amendment) in imaginative yet consistent ways. Certainly, it is unrealistic to expect that either flexible case-by-case assessment alone, or rigid and unreflective application of principles alone, could be sufficient to formulate sound public policy. The dogmatic approach is largely eschewed by prominent contemporary political intellectuals. However, many do regard every problem as unique, thus fostering public policies and legal decisions that do not in practice conform to any basic principles (except perhaps the principle of pragmatism itself). As a result, those who administer public policy and law more and more have become the ultimate arbiters of what will be acceptable public policy. And that, in turn, defeats the ideal of the rule of law, the only reasonable alternative to the rule of arbitrary human will, whether of a majority, a king, or a single ruling party. The rule of law allows everyone to participate in the assessment of public policy and legal decision making; we can all evaluate whether our policy and lawmakers are doing the right thing by reference to a knowable, objective standard. If no principles apply, then anything goes. Usually, the most emotionally appealing choice of the moment is accepted, which means that those who are most adept at expressing and manipulating emotions—the demagogues—are the ones who tend to carry the day. In emergencies, especially massive emergencies that have a wide impact on a society, the opportunities for such demagoguery abound.



**Impacts—Tyranny****We Must Reject All Intrusions On Liberty—Freedom is a Supreme Value**

Sylvester Petro, Wake Forest Professor, "Civil Liberty, Syndicalism, and the NLRA," Toledo Law Review, Spring 1974 (Lexis)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway - "I believe in only one thing: liberty." And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume's observation: "It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once." Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believed in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

**Impacts—Value to Life****Respect for the True Rights of Liberty is the Basis for Human Life—Destructions of Liberty and Dignity Destroys Value to Life**

Tibor Machan, Professor of Philosophy, Auburn University, *Private Rights and Public Illusions*, 1995 ( p. 65)

The legal system that promotes human dignity most successfully is the one that supports every individual's natural human rights. That is because such human rights, when fully respected, secure for everyone the full opportunity (within the bounds of nature) to act as a moral agent rather than as a subject of another moral agent. The most vital social condition for any person is the honoring of his or her dignity. If someone's dignity is destroyed, all other benefits that person reaps from others amount to very little and certainly serve as no compensation. Trading one's dignity is akin to selling one's soul; it takes away one's essential identity as the human being one is.

To be sure, numerous familiar public programs, such as entitlements (to services and goods secured at public expense) superficially appear to benefit recipients. In fact they are crucially flawed in large part because they erode respect for human dignity. So while certain features of a legal system may protect an individual's dignity, others familiar within the welfare state are harmful to it.

**Impacts—War****Free Market Economics is The Only Way to Prevent Violence and War**

JR Nyquist, geopolitical columnist, "ANATOMY OF A DELUSION," FinancialSense.com, September 8th, 2006  
(<http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2006/0908.html>)

The free market teaches men to love peace, while the miserable circumstances of socialist decline teach men the necessity of predatory warfare. According to Mises, the market's love of peace "does not spring from philanthropic considerations" but depends on a proper appreciation of economic self-interest. Those who believe in profit and the free market reject war because war signifies the destruction of property. Wars are not initiated by corporate greed. Wars are initiated by backward cults who seek a return to medieval conditions. World revolution is the cry of the militant socialists, the Marxist-Leninists of the People's Republic of China, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba and the KGB clique that presently governs the "former" Soviet Union. To understand world events properly we must understand the distinction between socialist and free market economies.

**Alternative—Debate Solves****Each Instance Has Meaning—Even in the Context of the Debate Round We Must Reject  
Government Intrusions on Liberty**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, PHILOSOPHY: WHO NEEDS IT? 1982 (p. 202)

Do not wait for a national audience. Speak on any scale open to you, large or small - to you friends, you associates, you professional organizations, or any legitimate public forum. You can never tell when your words will reach the right mind at the right time. You will see no immediate results - but it is of such activities that public opinion is made. If your letters are brief and rational, they will have more influence than you suspect.

**Alternative—Free Market Solves Cooperation****Free Markets Encourage Voluntary Cooperation to Prevent Coercion—People Have an Incentive to Help Society**

Edward W. Yonkins, Professor of Accountancy and Business Administration at Wheeling Jesuit University, "Civil Society: The Realm of Freedom," June 10, 2000 (<http://www.quebecoislibre.org/000610-11.htm>)

Capitalism involves the voluntary exchange of goods and services between free and self-responsible individuals to their mutual benefit. With the advent of specialization of labor, people found it necessary to develop an exchange mechanism through which a producer of one item could exchange it for something he would produce less efficiently than another. Voluntarism ensures that both parties to an economic transaction will gain from it. Each person enters a free market transaction because, in his own judgment, the result will be beneficial to him. Each party acquires something he values more in exchange for something he values less. The free market, a key component of civil society, developed as men realized that they could accomplish more through cooperation than they could individually. Cooperation can actually enhance a person's individuality by increasing his chances of attaining his goals and flourishing as a human being. In a world of scarce resources and self-interested individuals, each possessing the right to self-determination, it is essential for people to voluntarily cooperate with one another in order to attain their instrumental goals and pursue their needs for human inter-connectedness. This implies the need for a minimal state, the rule of law, the division of labor, and a secure system of property rights. Persons engaged in economic activity may be guilty of coercion, fraud, or theft in which one party will benefit at the other's expense. The proper role of the government under capitalism is to restrain and punish those who obstruct the practice of free exchange. In a free market economy people are rewarded for serving others and are punished only for injuring others. Capitalism is based on cooperation. Workers cooperate with their employers. Farmers cooperate with distributors and food processors. Manufacturers cooperate with distributors, both of whom are attempting to cooperate with consumers. Banks cooperate with individuals, firms, and families. Unions cooperate with corporations, etc. Capitalism is inherently relational – it fosters human interdependence and a mutualistic outlook. Voluntary exchange is a form of cooperation between buyers and sellers in which individuals can only promote their own interests by furthering the interests of others. Limited by the rule of law, individuals and groups prosper only to the degree that they offer products or services for which people are willing to trade. The consumer is sovereign under capitalism. The only way for an individual or corporation to grow and remain economically successful is to continually satisfy consumers. This calls for an increasing regard for the interests, desires, tastes, and opinions of consumers. Failure to adjust one's actions to the consumers' wishes will result in losses and the shifting of resources to those who serve consumers better. Under capitalism, successful competitors are those who cooperate with or satisfy others in society. Firms and individuals compete with one another in order to cooperate more effectively with the buying public. As a result, competition encourages invention, innovation, research, cost reductions, greater efficiency, and the development of new and better products and services. The variety of enterprise associations that exist are attempts to find better ways of attaining mutual purposes. Licensing agreements, joint ventures, outsourcing and other forms of strategic partnering are common today. Even apparent competitors sometimes find it advantageous to cooperate with one another in their efforts to acquire needed resources or access to markets! The profit-and-loss system in a voluntaristic society is just and moral.

**Alternative—Free Market Solves Environment****Private Free Market Ownership is the Best Way to Deal With Environmental Concerns**

Jonathon Adler, author of "Environmentalism at the Crossroads. "Ecology, Liberty and Property: A Free-Market Environmental Reader," The Commons: Markets Protecting the Environment, 1995  
([http://www.commonsblog.org/about\\_freemkt.php](http://www.commonsblog.org/about_freemkt.php))

Wherever we have exclusive private ownership, whether it is organized around a profit-seeking or nonprofit undertaking, there are incentives for the private owners to preserve the resource....[P]rivate ownership allows the owner to capture the full capital value of the resource, and self-interest and economic incentive drive the owner to maintain its long-term capital value.<sup>17</sup> Unlike public officials, private owners directly benefit from sound management decisions and suffer from poor ones. For incentives to work, the property right to a resource must be definable, defensible, and divestible. Owners must be free to transfer their property rights to others at will. Even someone indifferent or hostile to environmental protection has an incentive to take environmental concerns into account, because despoiling the resource may reduce its value in the eyes of potential buyers. The role of government is to protect property rights for environmental resources and secure the voluntary agreements property owners contract to carry out. Moreover, FME advocates insist on the application of common law liability rules to environmental harms, such as polluting a neighbor's property, to protect property rights and to provide additional incentives for good stewardship. To harm someone's property by polluting it is no more acceptable than vandalizing it.

## Alternative—Free Market Solves Violence

### Free Market Associations Mean that Interaction is Necessarily Voluntarily—No Possibility of Violence

Nathaniel Branden, psychotherapist, author, "Individualism and the Free Society, Part 2," January 1995, (<http://www.fff.org/freedom/0195d.asp>)

Whatever the differences in their specific programs, all the enemies of the free market economy—communists, socialists, fascists, welfare statists—are unanimous in their belief that they have a right to dispose of the lives, property, and future of others, that private ownership of the means of production is a selfish evil, that the more a person has achieved, the greater is his or her debt to those who have not achieved it, that men and women can be compelled to go on producing under any terms or conditions their rulers decree, that freedom is a luxury that may have been permissible in a primitive economy, but for the running of giant industries, electronic factories, and complex sciences, nothing less than slave labor will do. Whether they propose to take over the economy outright, in the manner of communists and socialists, or to maintain the pretense of private property while dictating prices, wages, production, and distribution, in the manner of fascists and welfare statists, it is the gun, it is the rule of physical force that they consider "kind," they who consider the free market "cruel." Since the moral justification offered for the rule of force is humankind's need of the things that persons of ability produce, it follows (in the collectivist's system of thought) that the greater an individual's productive ability, the greater are the penalties he or she must endure, in the form of controls, regulations, expropriations. Consider, for example, the principle of the progressive income tax: those who produce the most are penalized accordingly; those who produce nothing receive a subsidy, in the form of relief payments. Or consider the enthusiastic advocacy of socialized medicine. What is the justification offered for placing the practice of medicine under government control? The importance of the services that physicians perform—the urgency of their patients' need. Physicians are to be penalized precisely because they have so great a contribution to make to human welfare; thus is virtue turned into a liability. In denying human beings freedom of thought and action, statist and collectivist systems are anti-self-esteem by their very nature. Self-confident, self-respecting men and women are unlikely to accept the premise that they exist for the sake of others. A free society cannot be maintained without an ethics of rational self-interest. Neither can it be maintained except by men and women who have achieved a healthy level of self-esteem. And a healthy level of self-esteem cannot be maintained without a willingness to assert—and, if necessary, fight for—our right to exist. It is on this point that issues of psychology, ethics, and politics converge. If I may allow myself a brief aside, one might imagine that psychologists, social scientists, and philosophers who speak enthusiastically and reverently about freedom, self-responsibility, autonomy, the beauty of self-regulating systems, and the power of synergy (the behavior of whole systems unpredicted by the behavior of the parts taken separately) would naturally be champions of noncoercion. More often than not, as I have already indicated, just the opposite is true. They tend to be among the most vociferous in crying for the coercive apparatus of government to further their particular ideals. To quote Waterman once again: It should be recognized that a defining feature of a synergistic society is that participation in it is voluntary. If people do not choose to engage in a given cooperative activity, the implication is that they do not perceive that activity to be helpful, either for themselves or for others. Efforts to promote social cooperation within a synergistic society may appropriately include such techniques as education, persuasion, and negotiation. However, the use of political force to compel cooperation represents the abandonment of the synergistic ideal. A free society cannot automatically guarantee the mental or emotional well-being of all its members. Freedom from external coercion is not a sufficient condition of our optimal fulfillment, but it is a necessary one. The great virtue of capitalism—laissez-faire capitalism, as contrasted not only with the more extreme forms of statism but also with the mixed economy we have today—is that it is the one system whose defining principle is precisely this barring of physical coercion from human relationships. No other political system pays even lip service to this principle.

## Alternative—Free Market Solves Space

### Private Space Exploration is Better For Everyone Considered—The Destruction of American Space in the Status Quo Opens Up the Possibility of Successful Commercial Development

[Sunset District Libertarian Examiner](http://www.examiner.com/sunset-district-libertarian-in-san-francisco/the-case-for-de-funding-nasa), "The case for de-funding NASA," April 29th, 2011

(<http://www.examiner.com/sunset-district-libertarian-in-san-francisco/the-case-for-de-funding-nasa>)

Today, NASA's space shuttle Endeavour will make its [final launch](#) from the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Fla. -- part of a \$2 billion experiment to the International Space Station to gain information about dark matter and high-energy particles.

Although some, like NASA's Bill Gerstenmaier, the associate administrator for space operations, are excited about this "unique mission," I am relieved that Endeavor will soon be out of the heavens and retired in the California Science Center. Taxpayers should be relieved as well. Some [\\$17 billion](#) a year is siphoned away from the American people to fund NASA, a bureaucratic mess of cost overruns and waste. These traits are very typical of all government programs, of course, because of what government's top-heavy, centrally planning, and coercive structure lacks: the pricing and profit/loss mechanisms that only the market can provide.

The best thing that could happen for the future of space exploration, discovery, and information would be for NASA to retire all of its shuttles, send those billions back to the American people, and open the sky up to the free market. Private entrepreneurs tend to produce and invest in a way that attempts to minimize costs in order to gain profit, while government programs work in the exact opposite manner.

One of the best examples of this is when two MIT students, Justin Lee and Oliver Yeh, sent a camera into space to [photograph](#) the curvature of the Earth. For what it takes NASA millions of dollars to do, it took them \$150. This is because Lee and Yeh, relying on private initiative and the incentive to minimize costs, filled a weather balloon with helium and hung a styrofoam beer cooler underneath to hold the camera. NASA, with the reverse incentives, uses rockets, boosters, and expensive control systems that may draw "oohs" and "ahs," but at the expense of the terrible [opportunity costs](#) of taxation. NASA and its defenders claim, however, that it is because of this constant stream of tax revenue has benefited the American public by introducing many inventions and technological advancements, ignoring the [broken window fallacy](#) -- unintended consequences that accompany perceived production.

Besides, most of these innovations have actually been the result of commercial markets. [Telstar I](#), the world's first telecommunications satellite, was a product of AT&T's drive to provide a better communication service (only later to be used by the Defense Department). The telephone, personal computers, the Internet, Velcro, Tang, Tempur-Pedic mattresses, hand-calculators, and the [hundreds](#) of products created from the advantage of integrated circuits and semiconductors have advanced our lives through the mutual benefit of buyer and seller. Consumers, not bureaucrats, should decide where precious resources should go.

NASA also inflicts us with a misallocation of labor. The market's profit/loss mechanism is the only way that the labor involved, like scientists, is being put to its most economic and productive use. And like all government programs, it has become increasingly less efficient as time goes by and its goals have become more and more hazy; the "mission creep" of the chaotic absence of market prices.

If NASA were de-funded, the private sector could begin to deliver services that are actually valuable to consumers, things NASA barely emphasizes, like [employing robot satellites](#) that gather information about the Earth to supply the high demand for more accurate weather forecasts and geological assessments. Robot satellites can also accomplish most of the things that more expensive manned flights do, just without the rah-rah, nationalistic PR.



**Alternative—Free Market Solves Space (Empirical)****The Best Part of the Space Program is The Most Commercially Dominated—Empirically,  
Private Enterprise Does Space Better**

Edward L. Hudgins, Ph.D., Director of Advocacy and Senior Scholar for [The Atlas Society](http://www.atlas-society.com), "The Private Sector Road to a Space-faring Civilization," June 2004 ([http://www.ifri.org/files/CFE/space\\_privatization.pdf](http://www.ifri.org/files/CFE/space_privatization.pdf))

The most commercially successful part of the space sector – communications satellites - is that part dominated by private companies. The Satellite Industry Association estimates that worldwide satellite industry revenues was about \$90 billion in 2001, up from \$83 billion in 2000 and \$69 billion in 1999 with the American portion currently valued at \$37.5 billion. SIA estimates that there are 253,600 jobs in that industry worldwide, up from 205,400 in 1999, with 136,500 Americans employed. The Space Transportation Association Chairman Tidal McCoy puts the number of employees in space-related industries at 497,000. There is also a healthy private American launch industry, with Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Orbital as the principal suppliers. It is interesting to note that starting in the 1970s private companies were asking NASA to contract out to them for launch services – the way the Post Office contracted for mail transportation – but instead, the U.S. government, until the Shuttle Challenger disaster in 1986, actually banned government cargos from private rockets.

**Alternative—Free Market Solves Space (Empirical)****Empirically the Private Sector Can Transform Government Incentives On Its Own—This Will Push Research Faster than Any Government Action**

Where Hip-Hop and Libertarianism Meet, "[Space Flight To The Moon, May Return Thanks To Google](http://calulmann.com/2007/09/space-flight-to-the-moon-may-return-thanks-to-google.html)," September 14th, 2007 (<http://calulmann.com/2007/09/space-flight-to-the-moon-may-return-thanks-to-google.html>)

Google has announced a [\\$25 million prize for lunar space research](#). According to the New York Times "

The "Google Lunar X Prize" was announced yesterday in Los Angeles at the Wired magazine's NextFest. The contest calls for entrants to land a rover on the moon that will be able to travel at least 550 yards and send high-resolution video, still images and other data back home.

The X Prize Foundation saw the new contest as one of "the grand challenges of our time that we can use to move people forward," said Dr. Peter H. Diamandis, chairman and C.E.O. of the foundation.

The prize for reaching the moon and completing the basic tasks of roving and sending video and data will bring the winner \$20 million, according to the contest rules. An additional \$5 million would be awarded for other tasks that include roving more than 5,500 yards or sending back images of artifacts like lunar landers from the Apollo program.

The \$20 million grand prize will be available until Dec. 31, 2012, and then will drop to \$15 million for two years. The contest would be likely to end after that time, though Google and the foundation would be able to extend it.

Carnegie Mellon University has already agreed to enter the competition. NASA originally created the idea for the competition and assumed at least six or seven competitors.

It is good to see companies like Google furthering space research. Creating incentives for non-governmental entities to be involved in space exploration will push space research along faster than any amounts of funding given to NASA.

**Alternative—Reject Coercion****Indifference To Totalitarianism Enables Violence and Impositions on Liberty—We Must Reject All Instances of Government Coercion**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, "To All Innocent Communists," The Journals of Ayn Rand, 1940 (p.348)

The Totalitarians do not want your active support. They do not need it. They have their small, compact, well-organized minority and it is sufficient to carry out their aims. All they want from you is your indifference. The Communists<sup>^</sup> and the Nazis have stated repeatedly that the indifference of the majority is their best ally. Just sit at home, pursue your private affairs, shrug about world problems—and you are the most effective Fifth Columnist that can be devised. You're doing your part as well as if you took orders consciously from Hitler or from Stalin. And so, you're in it, whether you want to be or not, you're helping the world towards destruction, while moaning and wondering what makes the world such as it is today. You do. The Totalitarians have said: "Who is not against us, is for us." There is no personal neutrality. And since you are involved, and have to be, what do you prefer? To do what you're doing and help the Totalitarians? Or to fight them?

But in order to fight, you must understand. You must know exactly what you believe and you must hold to your faith honestly, consistently and all the time. A faith assumed occasionally, like Sunday clothes, is of no value. Communism and Nazism are a faith. Yours must be as strong and clear as theirs. They know what they want. We don't. But let us see now, before it is too late, whether we have a faith, what it is and how we can fight for it.

**Alternative—Reject Coercion****We Must Reject All Instances of Government Coercion—Allowing Statist Violations of Liberty Contaminates Our Stance Towards Freedom**

Murray Rothbard, former teacher at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, A New Liberty, "A Strategy for Liberty 1978 ([www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty14.asp](http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty14.asp))

There is another grave flaw in the very idea of a comprehensive planned program toward liberty. For the very care and studied pace, the very all-embracing nature of the program, implies that the State is not really the common enemy of mankind, that it is possible and desirable to use the State for engineering a planned and measured pace toward liberty. The insight that the State is the major enemy of mankind, on the other hand, leads to a very different strategic outlook: namely, that libertarians should push for and accept with alacrity any reduction of State power or activity on any front. Any such reduction at any time should be a welcome decrease of crime and aggression. Therefore, the libertarian's concern should not be to use the State to embark on a measured course of destatization, but rather to hack away at any and all manifestations of statism whenever and wherever he or she can. In keeping with this analysis, the National Committee of the Libertarian party in October 1977 adopted a declaration of strategy which included the following: We must hold high the banner of pure principle, and never compromise our goal?. The moral imperative of libertarian principle demands that tyranny, injustice, the absence of full liberty, and violation of rights continue no longer. Any intermediate demand must be treated, as it is in the Libertarian Party platform, as pending achievement of the pure goal and inferior to it. Therefore, any such demand should be presented as leading toward our ultimate goal, not as an end in itself. Holding high our principles means avoiding completely the quagmire of self-imposed, obligatory gradualism: We must avoid the view that, in the name of fairness, abating suffering, or fulfilling expectations, we must temporize and stall on the road to liberty. Achieving liberty must be our overriding goal. We must not commit ourselves to any particular order of destatization, for that would be construed as our endorsing the continuation of statism and the violation of rights. Since we must never be in the position of advocating the continuation of tyranny, we should accept any and all destatization measures wherever and whenever we can. Thus, the libertarian must never allow himself to be trapped into any sort of proposal for "positive" governmental action; in his perspective, the role of government should only be to remove itself from all spheres of society just as rapidly as it can be pressured to do so. Neither should there be any contradictions in rhetoric. The libertarian should not indulge in any rhetoric, let alone any policy recommendations, which would work against the eventual goal. Thus, suppose that a libertarian is asked to give his views on a specific tax cut. Even if he does not feel that he can at the moment call loudly for tax abolition, the one thing that he must not do is add to his support of a tax cut such unprincipled rhetoric as, "Well, of course, some taxation is essential?," etc. Only harm to the ultimate objective can be achieved by rhetorical flourishes which confuse the public and contradict and violate principle.

**Alternative—Reject Coercion****We Must be Willing To Reject Government Coercion at All Moments—Given the Option You Should Always Prefer the Alternative**

Murray Rothbard, Prof of Economics at UNLV, The Ethics of Liberty, 1982 (p.258)

If liberty is to be the highest political end, then this implies that liberty is to be pursued by the most efficacious means, i.e. those means which will most speedily and thoroughly arrive at the goal. This means that the libertarian must be an "abolitionist," i.e., he must wish to achieve the goal of liberty as rapidly as possible. If he balks at abolitionism, then he is no longer holding liberty as the highest political end. The libertarian, then, should be an abolitionist who would, if he could, abolish instantaneously all invasions of liberty. Following the classical liberal Leonard Read, who advocated immediate and total abolition of price-and-wage controls after World War II, we might refer to this as the "button-pushing" criterion. Thus, Read declared that "If there were a button on this rostrum, the pressing of which would release all wage-and-price controls instantaneously, I would put my finger on it and push!" The libertarian, then, should be a person who would push a button, if it existed, for the instantaneous abolition of all invasions of liberty—not something, by the way, that any utilitarian would ever be likely to do.<sup>5</sup>

**Alternative—Solves Better, Privatization****Privatized Highways and Infrastructure are Crucial to Economic Recovery**

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

There is enormous opportunity for entrepreneurship in highways—for example in catering to the special needs of truckers with liberalized width, height, and weight limits, and to car drivers by providing car-only lanes and real-time information about congestion, parking space availability, and commercial services. There is a plethora of new technologies being developed under the title "intelligent transportation" systems—gadgets to produce a map on a digital display in your car, to tell you what nearby services are available, and to tell you by synthetic voice where to turn. And smart weapons guidance technology from satellites and space-miniaturized sensors is being commercialized so that a variety of driver controls will soon be marketed to help the driver, or take over some car controls. Greyhound buses already carry collision avoidance radars, and on special lanes in California cars are being "hooked up" with the lead driver pulling a "train" of following cars by radio signals and computerized engine controls. Of a thousand such systems, perhaps 950 will be no more than gee whiz stories for Popular Science. But some will certainly find their way into use. Many will require that highways be adapted with special flyovers, ramps, and barriers, and that will require entrepreneurial profit-seeking management of the highways. In general, the bureaucratic mindset has difficulty coping with multiple use, so bureaucrats insist that HOV lanes be kept "uncontaminated" by solo drivers, even though almost everywhere, almost all the time, HOV lanes are extraordinarily wasteful, operating far below capacity. They also generate a political problem in that drivers in stop-and-start conditions on regular freeway lanes get infuriated by seeing an underutilized HOV lane next to them. They start breaking the rules and driving illegally in the HOV lanes, generating major enforcement problems, and they generate political pressure to liberalize entry rules. The obvious way to maximize HOV lane use, and make money, is to allow solo drivers (or sub-HOV vehicles) to "buy in" to HOV lanes with a variable toll. The purpose of the HOV lanes—encouragement of carpooling—can be maintained by allowing toll-paying vehicles up to the point where they begin to fill the lane to capacity. Raising prices can prevent the concertina effect of successive backups and crawls. Gerald Pfeffer's California Private Transportation Company is gambling that on SR-91 Express Lanes the SOV buy-ins will pay for the road and also for the free rides of the HOVs. Variable pricing will also be a go/no-go issue for the investors in SR-57-S over the Santa Ana River channel in Orange County.

**Alternative—Solves Railroads/Freight****Privatization of Highway Infrastructure is Crucial to Ensuring the Proper Distribution of Goods and Commodities**

Peter Samuel, freelance journalist, "Highway Aggravation: The Case For Privatizing The Highways," Policy Analysis, June 27th, 1995 (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-231.html>)

Advocates of free-market solutions have a great political opportunity to get into the problem-solving business and win wide political support in the mid-1990s by advocating and organizing a solution for traffic congestion on our urban freeways. That solution consists of progressive privatization of major highway service funded by time-flexible toll pricing and concession rights, combined with the phaseout of gasoline and diesel taxes and the federal and state highway agencies that live off them. Privatizing highways progressively and creating markets in highway service will make it possible to use resources more efficiently and to build as much highway capacity as people are willing to pay for.

The politics is right—people are properly distrustful of large state bureaucracies that live off taxation, and they demand lower taxes. The state highway agencies have largely given up on providing new service.

The technology is right—tolls no longer mean inefficient congestion-creating toll plazas collecting quarters like beggars; tolls can now be collected through small, cheap transponder tags, attached to a sun visor or windshield, that hold a prepaid stored value that gets debited by radio signal while the motorist drives by at highway speed.

The economics is right—the costs of congestion are a huge and growing burden not only on the peace of mind of commuters but also on the economy that depends heavily on free-flowing transportation of goods and services. And once the highway system is shown to be paying its way with tolls instead of from the public purse, it will be easier to argue for ending government subsidies for mass transit, the costs of which are strangling our big cities.

**Alternative—Solves Racism/Civil Rights****Private Transportation is Crucial to Enabling Civil Rights and Anti-Racist Activism**

[Sam Kazman](#), General Counsel of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "Auto-mobility and Freedom," The Atlas Society, September 2001 (<http://www.atlassociety.org/auto-mobility-and-freedom>)

The vision behind today's attacks on the car is largely an environmentalist vision. It's easy to forget that throughout history there have been other types of planning visions as well. In the South, in the first half of the twentieth century, the vision was white, not green. It was embodied in the Jim Crow laws. It's significant that one of the turning points in the civil rights struggle against those laws succeeded, in large part, because of the car.

The Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955 began when Rosa Parks, a black woman, refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white passenger. The boycott was a lengthy affair, marked by violence and the focus of national attention. But few people today realize that one major factor in the ultimate success of the boycott was the fact that its participants had access to cars. Here you had a government-regulated, segregated bus monopoly, and the way people got around that was to organize car pools and church van pools. Had it not been for the car, the bus boycott, which lasted for a whole year, would very likely have broken down.

Let me read to you some quotes from people who lived through that event, from a National Public Radio production entitled "Will The Circle Be Unbroken?"

Said one participant: "Many people offered their cars and ... would pick up people before they went to work every day. Some taxi drivers said that they would drive for free to help pick the people up."

But as the narrator explains, the police commissioner threatened to arrest any cab driver who charged less than the minimum fare. (The police chief must have been an antitrust scholar who knew predatory pricing when he saw it!)

From other participants: "We had church vans carrying people. And those of us who had automobiles, we had really a system." "Nobody passed anybody walking without stopping and picking them up."

There was a huge amount of police harassment. "Negroes were arrested for running a red light when there wasn't a red light there, and arrested for running a stop sign and there wasn't a stop sign there. They were arrested for speeding and sometimes they were standing still."

It didn't matter; this turning point in the civil-rights movement occurred because people had access to a form of transportation that was free of government control.



**AT: Urban Sprawl Bad****Urban Sprawl Should Be Celebrated—It Demonstrates the Success of Development and Expansion—The Alternative is Empirically Failed Socialist Planning**

The Atlas Society, "Urban Sprawl: Just Another Name for Growth and Prosperity," December 9th, 2005  
([http://www.atlassociety.org/urban\\_sprawl](http://www.atlassociety.org/urban_sprawl))

But if we embrace the Trojan horse of urban sprawl, what are the results?

Somebody out there—usually a bureaucrat with the word "planner" in his title—decides that the people in his jurisdiction would be better off if the forest was preserved in a green belt and the factory placed over here, the houses over there, and the highways replaced by some urban transit scheme. His wishes are imposed by regulations, laws, codes, and eminent domain on those who live within his zone of control.

This land use is not market-driven, but bureaucratically imposed. You, as a taxpayer, do have a dog in this race because you are paying for it. Your input into the process will be accepted with open arms if you suggest new ways to acquire additional funds, regulations, or power but will be ignored, vilified, and punished if you dare to question the process itself. So it boils down to this: The issue with urban sprawl is not the change in land use but whether market forces or bureaucrats will control it. If the bureaucrats do, it is called planned growth; if the market does, it is labeled urban sprawl. The urban sprawl denounced by the media is simply the idea that you get to do what you want with the property that you own. Planned growth means that the planners get to do what they want with the property that you own.

The ultimate result of planned growth is available for all to see in the old Soviet Union. The grim, depressing sight of apartments holding 5,000 people each, spaced like huge concrete chicken houses marching off into the gray distance; the wide avenues built for parades but deserted because they do not go where people want to go; and the forest parks made to look like the government's idea of what a forest should be all give visual evidence of the final result of the planner's world.

Unless you really like the way Moscow looks and works, you should celebrate urban sprawl and the continuing changes that free men can make in the uses of land when they are stimulated by free markets and a desire to make things better.

**AT: Privatized Infrastructure Doesn't Work****Your Arguments are Socialist Scare Tactics—Effective Distribution of Private Infrastructure Rights Will Encourage Substantial Investment and Development**

Sense of Life Objectivists, "Infrastructure in a Libertarian World," August 7th, 2008

(<http://www.solopassion.com/node/5115>)

One of the problems with a Libertarian form of Government, a problem in the sense it scares many people and confuses the rest, is how infrastructure projects or hospitals or schools would be initiated under a Libz Government.

Many people have visions of a free for all with half finished roads and hospital construction projects being abandoned when developers run out of money, others cannot quite see a spontaneous thought of "let's build a new motorway" popping into the head of the average Billionaire, and generally speaking there is a mental block with regards to many of these matters. I suggest it is this which scares people from voting Libertarian more than anything else; and also gives ammunition to the Socialist line that it is more sensible for the State to do all these things, due to confusion and lack of credibility to a Libz free for all.

Needless to say both the Socialists and the general public are wrong and we are right; and here is why...

What would be a good idea is to follow the model used regarding Oil exploration permits in New Zealand, whereby the Government calls for tenders and companies seeking an exploration permit in an area can submit a tender stating the specific area they will be searching in, their intended progress and timeline, and their financial means to carry out the project.

A benefit of this...(and there is much about the oil exploration process in New Zealand which is wrong and silly)...is only a company financially capable of oil exploration is issued a permit, and a timeline of work means no permit is given to someone who will simply do nothing.

It would be a fairly straightforward matter to simply call for tenders for anyone wanting to build a road, or school, or hospital, or hydro-dam or whatever.

Companies can then submit their business plan showing what they want to do, their timeframes, and showing they have the financial means to complete the project by way of bank loans, listing on the Stock Exchange, issuing bonds or whatever.

This will prevent a free for all which may lead to half finished projects creating an eye-sore on the New Zealand landscape and damaging the credibility of the Libertarian way of doing things.

But rather than a bureaucracy being created to administer this I believe get by with a relevant Minister and small staff of officials, who, after all are not actually initiating anything themselves, but rather simply reviewing timeframes and financial capabilities of companies suggesting entirely private projects.

An example of this is a small panelbeater in, say, Henderson asking to build a motorway between Te Kuiti and Gisborne (!) and being rejected because it would take 25 years and the net assets of the company are \$200,000; whereas Fulton Hogan suggesting the same project with their track record of road construction, and ability to raise a large amount of money to finance the project, and assurance it would take only 8 years, may well get the go ahead.

**AT: Alternative Not Realistic****Complaining that the Alternative is Not Realistic is Simply a Justification for Violating Freedom—Embracing the Alternative is the Path to Making Such Things Real**

Murray Rothbard, Prof of Economics at UNLV, The Ethics of Liberty, 1982 (p.258)

Anti-libertarians, and anti-radicals generally, characteristically make the point that such abolitionism is "unrealistic"; by making such a charge they hopelessly confuse the desired goal with a strategic estimate of the probable path toward that goal. It is essential to make a clear-cut distinction between the ultimate goal itself, and the strategic estimate of how to reach that goal; in short, the goal must be formulated before questions of strategy or "realism" enter the scene. The fact that such a magic button does not and is not likely to exist has no relevance to the desirability of abolitionism itself. We might agree, for example, on the goal of liberty and the desirability of abolitionism in liberty's behalf. But this does not mean that we believe that abolition will in fact be attainable in the near or far future.

The libertarian goals—including immediate abolition of invasions of liberty—are "realistic" in the sense that they could be achieved if enough people agreed on them, and that, if achieved, the resulting libertarian system would be viable. The goal of immediate liberty is not-unrealistic or—"Utopian" because—in contrast to such goals as the "elimination of poverty"—its achievement is entirely dependent on man's will. If, for example, everyone suddenly and immediately agreed on the overriding desirability of liberty, then total liberty would be immediately achieved.<sup>6</sup> The strategic estimate of how the path toward liberty is likely to be achieved is, of course, an entirely separate question.

**AT: Permutation****Mixing the Economy is Necessarily Evil—We Must Retain Anti-Statist Purity**

Leonard Peikoff, former professor of philosophy at New York University, "Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand", 1991 ( p. 373-374)

The terminal stage of a mixed economy is implicit in the system's definition. As the virtue of integrity tells us, compromise between good and evil leads to the triumph of evil. This applies to every field of human action, politics included. If one believes that individual rights may be overridden by government sometimes, "when the public welfare (or God) necessitates it," then one has conceded that rights are not inalienable, but are conditional on the requirements of a higher value. This means that man exists not by right, but by the permission of society or God. If so, the principle of individual rights has not been "moderated"; it has been thrown out in theory-in favor of the principle of statism, which, therefore, wins out in practice. Within certain limits, the course of a mixed economy is erratic. The country may waver between freer and more controlled periods; it may take statist, then antistatist, then superstatist lurches; it may reach its ultimate outcome slowly or rapidly-but the nature of the outcome is unaffected. If the statist element is not rejected in principle and repealed in total, it eventually consumes the last remnants of the individualist element. (The economic mechanism ensuring this result is the principle that controls necessitate further controls.)

**AT: Role Playing Good****Even in a World of Role Playing, You Should Reject the Affirmative—The Attempt to Utilize Government To Actualize Your Goals Will Be Coopted By More Powerful Interests**

Harry Browne, and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, "Why Government Doesn't Work", 1995 (p. 27)

You don't control the government. And your dreams of what government can achieve are just that—dreams. They bear no resemblance to what government will really do if your program is enacted. No one can control the government. Most people who tug at it end up disappointed—even if, for a while, they seem to be succeeding. If government, the agency of coercion, is a tool that can achieve your worthy ends, why shouldn't other people see it as the tool to achieve their purposes—including people who are thieves, bigots, politicians, mass murderers, bureaucrats, and judges? If government is going to do someone's bidding, is it likely to be your bidding—or that of people far more determined, far wealthier, and far more influential than you are? The government that's strong enough to give you what you want by taking it from someone else is strong enough to take everything you have and give it to someone else. The government you want to suppress your enemies can be used as easily by your enemies to attack you.

**AT: Our Plan Won't Be Coercive****Despite Your Intentions, Invoking Governmental Action Will Destroy the Positive Goals of The Affirmative—Governmental Bureaucracy Infringes on Even the Best Attempts**

Harry Browne, Former libertarian party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, "Why Government Doesn't Work" 1995 ,(p. 20-21)

Government grows also because well-meaning people like you and me believe it should do certain things that seem beyond controversy—find a cure for cancer, stop air pollution, keep violence off television, hold back an aggressor in the Middle East—something that everyone seems to agree should be done. Whatever the goal, it's easy to imagine that a single-minded government could achieve it. I call this The Dictator Syndrome. You see suffering or danger, and in your imagination you see a government program eliminating it. But in the real world the program would operate as you expect only if you were an absolute dictator—having at your disposal all of government's power to compel everyone to do things your way. Running the Gauntlet of Political Action Just for a moment, think about something you wish the government would do and that nearly everyone would like to see happen— provide swifter and surer punishment for criminals, teach children right and wrong, furnish health care to those who don't have it, bring peace to Bosnia, or whatever. Imagine a goal so important that it seems to justify using government's power to coerce. And now, consider what will actually happen to your program. To get it enacted you'll need political allies, since alone you have only limited influence. But other people will support your plan and work for it only if you modify it in dozens of ways that further their goals and satisfy their opinions. Suppose you make the necessary compromises and amass enough support to pressure the politicians to vote for your revised program. Who will write the actual law? You? Of course not. It will be written by the same legislators and aides who created all the laws, programs, and problems you object to now. Each of them will compromise your program still further to satisfy his political supporters. And if the law passes, who will administer it? You? Of course not. It will be implemented by bureaucrats—many of whom will use it to pursue goals quite different from what you had in mind. They won't care what your purpose was. It's their law now, and they'll use it to suit their objectives. And, lastly, the new law probably will generate many disputes— cases that must be settled in a courtroom. Who will decide those cases? You? Of course not. It will be the same judges who today rule according to their own beliefs, rather than by reference to the written law. A judge may even rule that your law means exactly the opposite of what you had intended. By the time your program has run this gauntlet, it will be far bigger and far more expensive (in money and disrupted lives) than you had imagined. And it will have been twisted to satisfy many factions. In fact, your program may end up being the opposite of what you had intended. In any case, you will have provided a new tool by which others can use government for their own ends.

**AT: Coercion/State Inevitable****Even if We Can't Avoid Every Instance, We Are Obligated to Reject Each Governmental Infringement on Liberty—Rejecting the Plan is Still Preferable**

Walter Block. Ph.D in economics. Journal of Libertarian Studies. "Government Inevitability: Reply to Holcombe," Summer, 2005 ( [www.mises.org/jls/19\\_3/19\\_3\\_4.pdf](http://www.mises.org/jls/19_3/19_3_4.pdf))

When put in these terms, the "logic" of the argument is plain to see. First of all, we have survived all these many years, nay, centuries, without the benefits of any world government. It is difficult to see that it is "inevitable." Second, even if it is unavoidable, arguendo, we are still required, as moral agents, to oppose this evil institution to our utmost. After all, no man is perfect. We all have flaws. In this sense, imperfection, too, is "inevitable." Does this mean we are somehow off the hook if we fail to ethically improve ourselves? Of course not. The only proper course of action is to strive mightily against the evil in our own hearts, no matter that we are predestined never to fully eradicate it. Holcombe is saying, in effect, "If rape is inevitable, relax and enjoy it." I am saying, "Even if rape is inevitable, keep fighting against this injustice." Then, too, "inevitability" springs only awkwardly from the pen of an economist such as Holcombe, for all such claims run head on into the primordial fact of free will.<sup>1</sup> If people can make choices—and they can—then nothing concerning human institutions can be "inevitable." To attempt to deny free will is, of necessity, to engage in it. When something cannot be denied apart from pain of self-contradiction, we can interpret it as necessarily occurring. Thus, government is not inevitable; only free will is. And, with the latter, the inevitable status of the state cannot logically be entertained, let alone insisted upon, as per Holcombe.

**AT: Impact Non-Unique****The Impact is Linear—Quantitative Increases in Violations Damage Societal Liberty and Destroy Freedom**

Murray Rothbard, professor at UNLV, Freedom, Inequality, Primitivism and the Division of Labor, 1970  
(<http://www.mises.org/fipandol/fipsec1.asp>)

Individual human beings are not born or fashioned with fully formed knowledge, values, goals, or personalities; they must each form their own values and goals, develop their personalities, and learn about themselves and the world around them. Every man must have freedom, must have the scope to form, test, and act upon his own choices, for any sort of development of his own personality to take place. He must, in short, be free in order that he may be fully human. In a sense, even the most frozen and totalitarian civilizations and societies have allowed at least a modicum of scope for individual choice and development. Even the most monolithic of despotisms have had to allow at least a bit of "space" for freedom of choice, if only within the interstices of societal rules. The freer the society, of course, the less has been the interference with individual actions, and the greater the scope for the development of each individual. The freer the society, then, the greater will be the variety and the diversity among men, for the more fully developed will be every man's uniquely individual personality. On the other hand, the more despotic the society, the more restrictions on the freedom of the individual, the more uniformity there will be among men and the less the diversity, and the less developed will be the unique personality of each and every man. In a profound sense, then, a despotic society prevents its members from being fully human.



**AT: Permutation****Allowing Positive Governmental Action Contaminates Any Attempt To Sustain Truly Free Market Principles**

Murray Rothbard, Dean of Austrian School, For A New Liberty, The Libertarian Manifesto, 19 73  
(<http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#p263>)

Thus, the libertarian must never allow him (or her)self to be trapped into any sort of proposal for "positive" governmental action; in his perspective, the role of government should only be to remove itself from all spheres of society just as rapidly as it can be pressured to do so. Neither should there be any contradictions in rhetoric. The libertarian should not indulge in any rhetoric, let alone any policy recommendations, which would work against the eventual goal. Thus, suppose that a libertarian is asked to give his views on a specific tax cut. Even if he does not feel that he can at the moment call loudly for tax abolition, the one thing that he (or she) must not do is add to his support of a tax cut such unprincipled rhetoric as, "Well, of course, some taxation is essential . . . ," etc. Only harm to the ultimate objective can be achieved by rhetorical flourishes which confuse the public and contradict and violate principle.

**AT: Permutation****Mixing the Economy is No Better than Socialism Itself—The Permutation Will Spill Over Into Government Domination**

Ayn Rand, *Philosopher Capitalism the Unknown Ideal*. 1967 (206)

A mixed economy is a mixture of freedom and controls—with no principles, rules, or theories to define either. Since the introduction of controls necessitates and leads to further controls, it is an unstable, explosive mixture which, ultimately, has to repeal the controls or collapse into dictatorship. A mixed economy has no principles to define its policies, its goals, its laws—no principles to limit the power of its government. The only principle of a mixed economy—which, necessarily, has to remain unnamed and unacknowledged—is that no one's interests are safe, everyone's interests are on a public auction block, and anything goes for anyone who can get away with it. Such a system—or, more precisely, anti-system—breaks up a country into an ever-growing number of enemy camps, into economic groups fighting one another for self preservation in an indeterminate mixture of defense and offense, as the nature of such a jungle demands. While, politically, a mixed economy preserves the semblance of an organized society with a semblance of law and order, economically it is the equivalent of the chaos that had ruled China for centuries: a chaos of robber gangs looting—and draining—the productive elements of the country.

A mixed economy is rule by pressure groups. It is an amoral, institutionalized civil war of special interests and lobbies, all fighting to seize a momentary control of the legislative machinery, to extort some special privilege at one another's expense by an act of government—i.e., by force. In the absence of individual rights, in the absence of any moral or legal principles, a mixed economy's only hope to preserve its precarious semblance of order, to restrain the savage, desperately rapacious groups it itself has created, and to prevent the legalized plunder from running over into plain, unlegalized looting of all by all—is compromise; compromise on everything and in every realm—material, spiritual, intellectual—so that no group would step over the line by demanding too much and topple the whole rotted structure. If the game is to continue, nothing can be permitted to remain firm, solid, absolute, untouchable; everything (and everyone) has to be fluid, flexible, indeterminate, approximate. By what standard are anyone's actions to be guided? By the expediency of any immediate moment.

The only danger, to a mixed economy, is any not-to-be-compromised value, virtue, or idea. The only threat is any uncompromising person, group, or movement. The only enemy is integrity.

**AT: Utilitarianism****Utilitarian Philosophy is a Tyrannical Imposition on the Function of the Individual**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, The Ayn Rand Column, 1962 (p. 90)

"The greatest good for the greatest number" is one of the most vicious slogans ever foisted on humanity.

This slogan has no concrete, specific meaning. There is no way to interpret it benevolently, but a great many ways in which it can be used to justify the most vicious actions.

What is the definition of "the good" in this slogan? None, except: whatever is good for the greatest number. Who, in any particular issue, decides what is good for the greatest number? Why, the greatest number.

If you consider this moral, you would have to approve of the following examples, which are exact applications of this slogan in practice: fifty-one percent of humanity enslaving the other forty-nine; nine hungry cannibals eating the tenth one; a lynching mob murdering a man whom they consider dangerous to the community.

There were seventy million Germans in Germany and six hundred thousand Jews. The greatest number (the Germans) supported the Nazi government which told them that their greatest good would be served by exterminating the smaller number (the Jews) and grabbing their property. This was the horror achieved in practice by a vicious slogan accepted in theory.

But, you might say, the majority in all these examples did not achieve any real good for itself either? No. It didn't. Because "the good" is not determined by counting numbers and is not achieved by the sacrifice of anyone to anyone.

**AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh****There is No Value To Life Under Governmental Coercion—You Should Prefer the Alternative**

Joseph Raz, Philosopher, *The Morality of Freedom* , 1986 (p. 307)

One way to test the thesis of the primacy of action reasons is to think of a person who is entirely passive and is continuously led, cleaned, and pumped full with hash, so that he is perpetually content, and wants nothing but to stay in the same condition. It's a familiar imaginary horror. How do we rank the success of such a life? It is not the worst life one can have. It is simply not a life at all. It lacks activity, it lacks goals. To the extent that one is tempted to judge it more harshly than that and to regard it as a 'negative life' this is because of the wasted potentiality. It is a life which could have been and was not. We can isolate this feature by imagining that the human being concerned is mentally and physically effected in a way which rules out the possibility of a life with any kind of meaningful pursuit in it. Now it is just not really a life at all. This does not preclude one from saying that it is better than human life. It is simply sufficiently unlike human life in the respects that matter that we regard it as only a degenerate case of human life. But clearly not being alive can be better than that life.

**AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh****Liberty Should Be Evaluated Above Extinction—The Sacrifice of Rights is Not Justified Based on Potential Violence**

Henry Shue, Professor of Ethics and Public Life, Princeton University, Nuclear Deterrence and Moral Restraint, 1989 (p. 64-65)

The issue raises interesting problems about obligations among generations. What obligations do we owe to future generations whose very existence will be affected by our risks? A crude utilitarian calculation would suggest that since the pleasures of future generations may last infinitely (or until the sun burns out), no risk that we take to assure certain values for our generation can compare with almost infinite value in the future. Thus we have no right to take such risks. In effect, such an approach would establish a dictatorship of future generations over the present one. The only permissible role for our generation would be biological procreation. If we care about other values in addition to survival, this crude utilitarian approach produces intolerable consequences for the current generation. Moreover, utility is too crude a concept to support such a calculation. We have little idea of what utility will mean to generations very distant from ours. We think we know something about our children, and perhaps our grandchildren, but what will people value 8,000 years from now? If we do not know, then there is the ironic prospect that something we deny ourselves now for the sake of a future generation may be of little value to them. A more defensible approach to the issue of justice among generations is the principle of equal access. Each generation should have roughly equal access to important values. We must admit that we shall not be certain of the detailed preferences of increasingly distant generations, but we can assume that they will wish equal chances of survival. On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that they would want survival as a sole value any more than the current generation does. On the contrary, if they would wish equal access to other values that give meaning to life, we could infer that they might wish us to take some risks of species extinction in order to provide them equal access to those values. If we have benefited from "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," why should we assume that the next generation would want only life?

**AT: Extinction Impacts Outweigh****Focusing on the Raw Fact of Survival is Itself a Form of Tyranny**

Daniel Callahan, Fellow at the Institute of Society and Ethics, Tyranny of Survival, 1973 (p. 91)

The value of survival could not be so readily abused were it not for its evocative power. But abused it has been. In the name of survival, all manner of social and political evils have been committed against the rights of individuals, including the right to life. The purported threat of Communist domination has for over two decades, fueled the drive of militarists for ever-larger defense budgets, no matter what the cost to other social needs. During World War II, native Japanese Americans were herded, without due process of law, into detention camps. This policy was later upheld by the Supreme Court in *Korematsu v. United States* (1944) in a general consensus that a threat to national security can justify acts otherwise blatantly unjustifiable. The survival of the Aryan race was one of the official legitimizations of Nazism. Under the banner of survival, the government of South Africa imposed a ruthless apartheid, heedless of the most elementary human rights. The Vietnamese war has been one of the greatest of the many absurdities tolerated in the name of survival, the destruction of villages in order to save them. But it is not only in a political setting that survival has been evoked as a final and unarguable value. The main rationale B.F. Skinner offers in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* for the controlled and conditioned society is the need for survival. For Jacques Monod, in *Chance and Necessity*, survival requires that we overthrow almost all known religious, ethical, and political system. In genetics, the survival of the gene pool has been put forward as grounds for a forceful prohibition of bearers of offensive genetic traits from marrying and bearing children. Some have suggested we do the cause of survival no good by our misguided medical efforts to find means by which those suffering from such common genetically based diseases as diabetes can live a normal life and thus procreate more diabetics. In the field of population and environment, one can do no better than to cite Paul Ehrlich, whose works have shown a high dedication to survival, and in its holy name a willingness to contemplate governmentally enforced abortions and a denial of food to starving populations of nations which have not enacted population-control policies. For all these reasons, it is possible to counterpoise over against the need for survival a "tyranny of survival." There seems to be no imaginable evil which some group is not willing to inflict on another for the sake of survival, no rights, liberties or dignities which it is not ready to suppress. It is easy, of course, to recognize the danger when survival is falsely and manipulatively invoked. Dictators never talk about their aggressions, but only about the need to defend the fatherland, to save it from destruction at the hands of its enemies. But my point goes deeper than that. It is directed even at legitimate concern for survival, when that concern is allowed to reach an intensity which would ignore, suppress or destroy other fundamental human rights and values. The potential tyranny of survival as a value is that it is capable, if not treated sanely, of wiping out all other values. Survival can become an obsession and a disease, provoking a destructive singlemindedness that will stop at nothing. We come here to the fundamental moral dilemma. If, both biologically and psychologically, the need for survival is basic to man, and if survival is the precondition for any and all human achievements, and if no other rights make much sense without the premise of a right to life - then how will it be possible to honor and act upon the need for survival without, in the process, destroying everything in human beings which makes them worthy of survival. To put it more strongly, if the price of survival is human degradation, then there is no moral reason why an effort should be made to ensure that survival. It would be the Pyrrhic victory to end all Pyrrhic victories.

**AT: Objectivism Immoral****The Alternative's Ability to Access Self-Actualization is a Prior Concern—Morality is Impossible Without It**

Edward Feser, Professor of Philosophy at Loyola Marymount, On Nozick, 2004 (p. 49-50)

More hopeful is the strategy, pursued by a large number of libertarian philosophers, of appealing to a broadly Aristotelian account of morality (Mack 1981; Machan 1989; Rasmussen and Den Uyl 1991; Smith 1995). On Aristotle's view, the fundamental moral question is not "What is the right thing to do?" but rather "What traits of character should I develop?" Only when one has determined what traits these are --that is, what habitual patterns of action count as virtues can one go on to answer the subordinate question of how one ought to act in a particular case (the answer being that one should act the way someone possessing the virtue relevant to that situation would act). What count as the virtues, in turn, are just those qualities most conducive to enabling human beings to fulfill the potentials which distinguish them as the unique sorts of beings they are — those qualities, that is, which best allow human beings to flourish given their distinctive human nature. Given that human beings are by nature rational animals, we can flourish only if we practice those virtues governing practical and theoretical reason. It follows that we have reason to acquire intellectual virtues like truthfulness and practical virtues such as temperance and courage, and to avoid such corresponding vices as licentiousness and cowardice. Given that human beings are also by nature social animals, we can only flourish if we practice also those virtues governing interaction with other human beings, so that we have reason to acquire such social virtues as honesty and loyalty. Though the moral life will involve decision-making about what to do in a particular concrete situation, then, it involves more basically the gradual development of a good character by the taking on of the virtues and the weeding out of vices — it essentially involves, that is, a process of self-perfection. Only a person who voluntarily decides to do so can carry out this process, however virtue must be freely chosen if it is truly to count as virtue. Moreover, the specific requirements of virtuous behavior depend to a considerable extent on the unique circumstances of the situation and the individual person involved, circumstances knowable only to that person himself in the concrete contexts of moral decision-making. The moral life, then, is only fully possible under conditions wherein the individual is capable of self-direction (in Rasmussen and Den Uyl's terms), the absence of coercion and interference from outside forces. Allowing others such self-direction is necessary too if the individual is to allow those others also to develop the virtues; and in general, respecting others' autonomy is essential if one is successfully to cooperate with them as fellow citizens, and thus fulfill one's own nature as a social being. Given the centrality of self-direction to self-perfection, then, respect for the rights of self-ownership turns out to be required for the successful pursuit of the moral life.

**Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Good****Government Investment in Transportation Infrastructure is Crucial to Economic Development and Enabling Free Market Development**

Videri History Blog, "Steven P. Erie, Globalizing L.A.: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development, 2004," September 11th, 2010 (<http://videri.wikidot.com/erieglobalizing>)

As one fictional teacher once proclaimed to his students, "Atlas Shrugged is about what would happen if people could create a utopia away from the dystopia of society... That and trains." (CK, Downtown Owl) UCSD Political Scientist Steven P. Erie pushes back against the assertion that telecommunications and lifestyles serve as the key to revitalizing urban regions. Instead, Erie embraces his inner anti- John Galt suggesting the key to long term economic growth remains transportation infrastructure and the proprietary city agencies that control them. Offending Objectivists everywhere, Erie credits independent public servants helming proprietary departments along with the larger players such as L.A. Mayor Tom Bradley for attending to infrastructure expansion, developing its ports, harbors, and airports to the extent that they served as "global gateways." Pacific Rim and Latin American trade intersect in metropolitan Los Angeles creating jobs regionally and nationally.

Erie asserts that the advantages of transportation infrastructure faded from theory as intellectual properties and the internet exploded in the 1990s. However, Los Angeles serves as Erie's primary example of the importance in the more prosaic aspects of urban history/policy. Once derided by Chicago School types (think Ellsworth Monkton Toohey, the critic in the Fountainhead) as atypical of municipal development, a black sheep, it now "serves as a harbinger of a new urban spatial forms and social relations" an interracial city of "multiple urban cores" (205 or 204). The key to such developments lay in Los Angeles' unique municipal structure. Water, Power, harbors, and airports operate under the authority of the city but as "proprietary departments" meaning, their heads served independent of politics and its revenues could not be diverted (this was achieved through numerous charter changes, and bond referendums – and like votes on planning issues- which also involved the citizenry at levels that Erie argues gave them a voice in regional development – Ayn Rand does not approve! – despite Ms. Rand's protestations it does seem a bit contradictory by Erie to claim on one hand the origins of the proprietary departments rest in large part to the voting public then in several instances illustrate how such charter changes/referendum often were called as special elections in which the government knew turnout would be awful then ramp up city workers who represented a large portion of the electorate to vote thus securing development victories ... worthy of machine politics greatest heights – would Amy Bridges argue this as an example of reform governments ie. Pro development, business oriented, and resorting to thinly veiled machine tactics). Of course, business interests only resorted to using public authorities as a pro development cudgel because Southern Pacific – Good God! Hank Reardon save us! – treated local commercial interests among others, shabbily. The key to the proprietary departments lay in their ability to accumulate profits which then can be directed into infrastructure expansion, outpacing other regional players most notably San Diego. Moreover, as independent entities, departments felt less political pressure to cave to short term interests, pursuing long term goals more frequently.



**Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Good****The Objectivist Objection to Transportation Infrastructure is Pure Nonsense—This Investment is in Each Individual's Economic and Political Self Interest**

Scene: Enough, Political Blog, "[Radicalized Republicans Flunk Self-Interest](http://sceneenough.com/tag/objectivism/)," May 21st, 2012

(<http://sceneenough.com/tag/objectivism/>)

This manifestly self-debilitating ineptness has taken several forms in several areas of American life, altogether some combination of demographics, economics and politics. One particularly glaring oversight by the Republican Party, one largely mathematical in this case is that the Republican Party ever more vigorously advocates for an ever shrinking political constituency, a constituency it seems intent on actively shrinking itself. This is an ideological peculiarity I would take a look at if I were them.

I wouldn't want to underestimate the role irrepressible base malice plays in Republican political behavior, though I would point out that in the political realm it can be strongly antithetical to self-interest, and in which regard I would note that scorching rhetoric about immigration which gratuitously antagonizes the nation's fastest growing demographic, efforts to restrict voting by minorities, which are becoming a larger segment of the voting public, and by college students and the young in general, who of course are going to be around awhile, and by seniors, of which there are increasing numbers as the baby boomers age seems to reverse all previously understood maxims regarding self-interest in the realm of politics. True self-interest, meaning thinking in terms of many election cycles to follow rather than only the next, might indicate that pulling back in the numerous states where Republicans have undertaken conspicuously restrictive voter measures on the basis of manifestly fictional voter fraud would be the wiser course, or to put it more appropriately more in Republicans' self-interest.

But the worst failure of understanding of self-interest by the glorifiers of self-interest is in the area of economics. The inept caricature of liberals by the right is that liberals care only about or excessively about other people, to the point of antagonism to their own self interest. In actuality, liberals understand the fortification of public schools, public universities, transportation infrastructure, the safety net and government programs all redound eventually to their own self-interest and the nation's prosperity. The degree to which creating and sustaining broad consumer demand and spreading the tools required to become an economically empowered consumer in an economy seventy percent dependent upon consumer spending would seem to be Self-Interest 101 for the spiritual devotees of self-interest. Yet Republicans flunk it time and time again.

There seems to be some sort of blind spot, perhaps congenital in the Republican world view preventing them from comprehending that sometimes what initially seems to be only in the economic interest of others, what exacts a cost in the beginning has a direct causality in terms of self-interested benefit later on. There are many things about capitalism and the theoretical father of capitalism Adam Smith the right perpetually fails to understand, particularly that immaculately misunderstanding boob Ayn Rand, but in fact, the Invisible Hand of self interest purportedly valuable to society overall, was not seen as the rapacious plundering of an empowered financial or corporate or feudal class, but that of the broadest spectrum of ordinary workers...in other words, the middle class.

## Aff—Alternative Immoral and Violent

### **The Selfishness and Bigotry of Objectivism is Especially True When Considering Public Infrastructure—The Alternative Leads to the Death of the Poor and Oppressed and the Benefit of Billionaire Greed**

George Monbiot, Environmental and Political Activist and Author, "A Manifesto for Psychopaths," The Guardian, March 6th, 2012 (<http://www.monbiot.com/2012/03/05/a-manifesto-for-psychopaths/>)

It has a fair claim to be the ugliest philosophy the post-war world has produced. Selfishness, it contends, is good, altruism evil, empathy and compassion are irrational and destructive. The poor deserve to die; the rich deserve unmediated power. It has already been tested, and has failed spectacularly and catastrophically. Yet the belief system constructed by Ayn Rand, who died 30 years ago today, has never been more popular or influential.

Rand was a Russian from a prosperous family who emigrated to the United States. Through her novels (such as *Atlas Shrugged*) and her non-fiction (such as *The Virtue of Selfishness*(1)) she explained a philosophy she called Objectivism. This holds that the only moral course is pure self-interest. We owe nothing, she insists, to anyone, even to members of our own families. She described the poor and weak as "refuse" and "parasites", and excoriated anyone seeking to assist them. Apart from the police, the courts and the armed forces, there should be no role for government: no social security, no public health or education, no public infrastructure or transport, no fire service, no regulations, no income tax.

*Atlas Shrugged*, published in 1957, depicts a United States crippled by government intervention, in which heroic millionaires struggle against a nation of spongers. The millionaires, whom she portrays as Atlas holding the world aloft, withdraw their labour, with the result that the nation collapses. It is rescued, through unregulated greed and selfishness, by one of the heroic plutocrats, John Galt.

The poor die like flies as a result of government programmes and their own sloth and fecklessness. Those who try to help them are gassed. In a notorious passage, she argues that all the passengers in a train filled with poisoned fumes deserved their fate(2,3). One, for example, was a teacher who taught children to be team players; one was a mother married to a civil servant, who cared for her children; one was a housewife "who believed that she had the right to elect politicians, of whom she knew nothing".

Rand's is the philosophy of the psychopath, a misanthropic fantasy of cruelty, revenge and greed. Yet, as Gary Weiss shows in his new book *Ayn Rand Nation*, she has become to the new right what Karl Marx once was to the left: a demi-god at the head of a chiliastic cult(4). Almost one-third of Americans, according to a recent poll, have read *Atlas Shrugged*(5), and it now sells hundreds of thousands of copies every year.

Ignoring Rand's evangelical atheism, the Tea Party movement has taken her to its heart. No rally of theirs is complete without placards reading "Who is John Galt?" and "Rand was right". Ayn Rand, Weiss argues, provides the unifying ideology which has "distilled vague anger and unhappiness into a sense of purpose." She is energetically promoted by the broadcasters Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh and Rick Santelli. She is the guiding spirit of the Republicans in Congress(6). Like all philosophies, Objectivism is absorbed second-hand by people who have never read it. I believe it is making itself felt on this side of the Atlantic: in the clamorous new demands to remove the 50p tax band for the very rich, for example, or among the sneering, jeering bloggers who write for the *Telegraph* and the *Spectator*, mocking compassion and empathy, attacking efforts to make the world a kinder place.

It is not hard to see why Rand appeals to billionaires. She offers them something that is crucial to every successful political movement: a sense of victimhood. She tells them that they are parasitised by the ungrateful poor and oppressed by intrusive, controlling governments.

## Aff—Cars Good

**Enabling Car Transport is Essential—It is Crucial to Forms of Objectivist and Identity Based Self Understanding and Privacy**

[Sam Kazman](#), General Counsel of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "Auto-mobility and Freedom," The Atlas Society, September 2001 (<http://www.atlassociety.org/auto-mobility-and-freedom>)

The basic challenge today is re-legitimizing the car, establishing a moral basis for its defense. About five years ago, CEI asked Loren Lomasky, a philosophy professor at Bowling Green State University in Ohio, to do a monograph on the car. We did not want a Chamber-of-Commerce-type defense of the car; we didn't want statistics on car sales or car-related jobs or the auto industry's contribution to gross domestic product. After all, a heroin producer could say the same things about contributing to the economy, but that wouldn't do much for legitimizing his work. What we wanted was an ethical defense of a car. [And Professor Lomasky produced a very fine monograph, which is available on CEI's web site.](#) Basically, he concluded that the car is one of the three most liberating technologies ever developed (the other two being the printing press and the microchip). It is one of the technologies that has most enhanced our ability to engaged in the fundamental human attribute of self-directed action.

The car's connection to freedom of physical motion may seem obvious, but Professor Lomasky examines its less obvious contribution to several other aspects as well.

One of these in involves knowledge. Philosophers sometimes distinguish between knowledge by description and knowledge by acquaintance. Knowledge by description is what you learn from reading, knowledge by acquaintance is what you learn from experience. You can do all the reading you want about Chicago, you can read everything you want about it, and maybe view everything on the Web. But if you tell someone, "I really know Chicago," and they ask, "Have ever been there," and you say no, it is clear that you've been pulling their leg. Much knowledge, especially of actual locales, is acquired by going and seeing. For intermediate ranges, even for some very long distances, nothing exceeds the ability of a car to allow a person to do that. When it comes to your city, the outlying areas, the farms within a day's trip, nothing enables you to know them like the car. There may be exceptions, such as the densely populated core areas of certain cities where you might learn far more by walking, but for most of the world, at least the paved world, the best way is going to be the car. Another liberating aspect of the car involves the issue of privacy. When you get into your car and close the door, you have incredible control over your environment, such as what you listen to and whom, if anyone, you're with. It may well exceed the bathroom as a privacy-enhancing chamber of twentieth-century life.

But the car also allows people to achieve privacy in another way. The dense, urban lifestyle is something that a lot of people do not like, and quite often that includes immigrants to this country who have left precisely that style of life. There is a wonderful book by Joel Garreau called [Edge City](#) (1991), in which he interviewed some immigrants from India who were living way out in the boondocks of a Houston suburb. Why was there an Indian community out there? You might think that Indians are accustomed to density. But that's just it; as one immigrant explains, in India you have no privacy. There is no such thing, because you live in a house with thirty family members. So when you get your first taste of privacy in the United States, it becomes very, very precious.

Lastly, the automobile vastly expands your range of economic opportunities. Throughout most of history, where you lived was pretty much where you worked. That changed somewhat with the Industrial Revolution; the question then became: Where could you move to in order to work and live? But only with the car was there a true disaggregation of the two. With the car, working in one place still left you free to live in a huge range of other places. And if you lost a job in one place, you no longer had to pull up roots and move. Being able to choose where we live is incredibly important, because in large part we are choosing who most of our friends are going to be. Professor Lomasky concludes that Detroit did more to liberate and dignify labor than all of the Socialist Internationals combined.

**Aff—Extinction Outweighs****Existence is a Prerequisite to and the Basis of All Values—We Must Prevent Extinction**

Ayn Rand, Philosopher, *The Virtue of Selfishness* 1964 (p. 17)

It is only an ultimate goal, an end in itself, that makes the existence of values possible. Metaphysically, life is the only phenomenon that is an end in itself: a value gained and kept by a constant process of action.

Epistemologically, the concept of "value" is genetically dependent upon and derived from the antecedent concept of "life." To speak of "value" as apart from "life" is worse than a contradiction in terms. "It is only the concept of 'Life' that makes the concept of 'Value' possible."

In answer to those philosophers who claim that no relation can be established between ultimate ends or values and the facts of reality, let me stress that the fact that living entities exist and function necessitates the existence of values and of an ultimate value which for any given living entity is its own life. Thus the validation of value judgments is to be achieved by reference to the facts of reality. The fact that a living entity is, determines what it ought to do. So much for the issue of the relation between "is" and "ought."

Now in what manner does a human being discover the concept of "value"? By what means does he first become aware of the issue of "good or evil" in its simplest form? By means of the physical sensations of pleasure or pain. Just as sensations are the first step of the development of a human consciousness in the realm of cognition, so they are its first step in the realm of evaluation.

The capacity to experience pleasure or pain is innate in a man's body; it is part of his nature, part of the kind of entity he is. He has no choice about it, and he has no choice about the standard that determines what will make him experience the physical sensation of pleasure or of pain. What is that standard? His life.

**Aff—Alternative→ Corporate Domination****Your Alternative Allows for Corporate Domination of Life and Darwinist Tolerance of Violence**

Christina M. Anastasia, Western International University, A Review of Objectivism, January 2005

(<http://www.onlineadjunct.biz/OBJECTIVISM.pdf>)

Rejecting the concept of a laissez-faire capitalistic market, Barry and Stephens (1998) argue that the fundamental principles of objectivism must be questioned and critiqued. The authors go on to say "Our critique of objectivism rests on the fact that its account of integrity provides no philosophical advance beyond the amoral theory of commerce; in essence, objectivism constitutes a pseudo-ethical apologia for self-interested business as usual"(p. 163). However, the authors claim that because the philosophy is not mentioned in several academic periodicals that it does not deserve recognition. This unfortunate view shows bias and weakens the argument by asking the question, "Can a philosophy be discounted simply because it was conceived by a non academic?" Hitchens (2001), states "A number of successful and smart dot-com moguls have recently gone public as Randian or Objectivist models." (p.1). Hitchens (2001) goes on to say, "Once again, it is difficult to see what is specifically Objectivist about certain positions, just as it can be 14 hard to discern the difference between "the virtue of selfishness" as Rand pugnaciously phrased it, and the milder statements of "enlightened self-interest" that date back at least as far as Adam Smith and his injunction that it is "not from the benevolence" of the merchant that we expect our on-time delivery of needed commodities" (p.2). Yet again, presenting another argument against a laissez-faire capitalistic market, authors Knights and Mueller (2004) warn "The danger of the objective approach is to slip into a reification of the so-called objective features of strategy and the context in which it resides"(p56). "The realm of the 'objective' exists through structures, capital markets, corporate governance structures, and labour and product markets. The often economics-based literature treats these as 'objective' in the sense that structures are independent of the actions of any one agent." The authors go so far as to hint that Objectivism falls into a Darwinist category. They continue their argument with, "Here corporations are seen to depend almost completely on the resources that they can command, balanced against the pressures generated externally in the environment. Strategy will be based on identifying the most critical resources for the survival of the organization and ensuring some degree of control over them"

## Aff—Taxation Good

## Taxation is Not Theft—Best Analogy is Membership in a Private Club—Libertarians Should Logically Support the Benefits Derived From Taxes

Alas Politics Blog, "Is Taxation Theft?" April 14th, 2011 (<http://www.amptoons.com/blog/2011/04/14/is-taxation-theft/>)

There's an argument you get a lot from either Libertarian-types or Republican economic-conservative types in general, which goes something like, "My money's my money, and it's not only a bad idea (in a pragmatic way) for the government to take it, it's morally wrong." The argument is that taxation is non-consensual taking of money with the threat of force, and as such, is no different than any other non-consensual taking of money with the threat of force ... theft, in other words.<sup>1</sup> I'm not interested in arguing whether or not progressive taxation is a good idea, or whether higher or lower tax rates are the way to go ... not here, anyway. I'm just addressing this argument, that taxation (especially progressive taxation) is morally suspect.

My argument is essentially that America is a club, with a membership fee.

It's a club dedicated to wealth creation.<sup>2</sup> Members of this club get access to an infrastructure and institutional support that allows for better wealth creation than most similar 'clubs' around the world, but as part of that, the club charges a fee.

Now, the good news is, the fee charged varies with how well the club's methods have worked for the wealth creation of the individual ... they only start charging larger fees when the club's program is really successful for someone.

And, if it turns out that you don't like your membership, you're free to leave the club at any time! The only thing you can't do is take advantage of the infrastructure, security, and programs the club offers without paying your membership fee. You can't be a free rider, in other words.

The most obvious objection is, "hey, I never signed up for any damn club." And that's true. By virtue of the way countries work, most people are born into one, rather than going country shopping and choosing carefully.

That having been said, I think that this is where we discuss childhood, a period in which you learn the rules of the club, bear few of the costs, and receive only a limited set of the club benefits.

During this period, your, "trial membership," to the club, you learn when a full membership will accrue, what the benefits are, and what the costs are. You get to test-drive membership for 18 years. There are no secrets or surprises. You get a trial period in which you learn the rules. You get an opportunity to decide to live elsewhere.

If, granting all of that, the club works out really well for you, you make a lot of money, and the club bills you for your membership ... well, it's hard to muster much sympathy. If you keep living here and reaping the benefits, you'll be expected to contribute to the upkeep.

The crux of my argument is that there are arrangements much like the governmental arrangement that exist (or might reasonably exist) as a matter of private initiative, and that Libertarians generally find these arrangements unproblematic.

Another argument for the involuntary/morally suspect nature of taxation is that the cost of changing country (or government) is so high that it ought not be considered a voluntary option. I'm somewhat sympathetic to this, but I have to ask those who agree with this argument whether they consider most work arrangements voluntary?

I have no hard data on this (of course), but I'd wager good money that the number of people who would like to relocate to another country but are stopped by the cost of doing so are absolutely eclipsed by the number of people who would like to leave their jobs but are stopped by the cost of doing so. More people feel, "trapped in their jobs," than, "trapped in their country."<sup>3</sup> So, yeah. If you're arguing that it's involuntary for me to go to work every morning, maybe I agree, but I'm surprised that you're<sup>4</sup> making that argument.

The second argument is that even if the individual were to decide to change location, there are no 'cost-free' or non-taxing alternatives ... from a libertarian point of view, you must choose between taxation and ... taxation. Thus, the availability of relocation is immaterial.

Unsurprisingly, I don't find this very persuasive either, in terms of determining how voluntary things are. The fact that nobody will give you a corned beef sandwich for free doesn't make it somehow involuntary when you buy it. Nor does it make it more involuntary if all available food costs money.

The final argument goes to the initiation of force. "Wait, Myca! A simple club doesn't have armies and policemen and the IRS ready to KILLLLLLL you if you skip out on paying its dues!"

My response? Sure it does. If you commit theft of services or trespass (which is what continuing to use club facilities without paying club dues is), then you'll be arrested. Because a private actor will rightly consider your actions the initiation of force, and will respond by getting the government involved. My understanding has always been that Libertarians stood in favor of government protection of the enforcement of private contracts. The fact that your health club doesn't have armed guards doesn't mean that they can't get some there with a single phone call. This is a distinction without a difference.